

THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY

VOLUME IX CONTENTS FOR AUGUST, 1945 NUMBER 3

THE VETERAN AS A POSTWAR STUDENT.....	295
<i>M. A. F. Ritchie, USNR</i>	
BASIL MANLY, FREDERICK A. P. BARNARD, AND THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA CURRICULUM INQUIRY, 1852-1854.....	306
<i>E. V. Wills, Washington, D. C.</i>	
TRINITY COLLEGE, 1839-1892: THE BEGINNINGS OF DUKE UNIVERSITY..	312
<i>Nora C. Chaffin, Dean of Women, Vanderbilt University</i>	
SAMUEL LANDER, EDUCATIONAL PIONEER.....	326
<i>Mrs. John O. Willson, Anderson, South Carolina</i>	
A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE KENTUCKY ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.....	336
<i>James H. Hewlett, Dean, Centre College of Kentucky</i>	
THE ASSOCIATION OF GEORGIA COLLEGES.....	346
<i>W. D. Hooper, Professor of Latin, University of Georgia</i>	
THE ASSOCIATION OF ALABAMA COLLEGES.....	352
<i>T. H. Napier, Dean, Alabama College, Montevallo</i>	
THE TENNESSEE COLLEGE ASSOCIATION.....	362
<i>C. Hodge Mathes, Professor of Modern Languages, East Tennessee State College</i>	
A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE MISSISSIPPI ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES.....	379
<i>J. B. Young, President, Jones County Junior College</i>	
THE LOUISIANA COLLEGE CONFERENCE: A BRIEF HISTORY.....	390
<i>H. L. Griffin, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, Southwestern Louisiana Institute</i>	
ACTIONS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION, JULY 22, MEMPHIS, TENNESSEE.....	399
FIFTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON WORK CONFERENCES ON HIGHER EDUCATION.....	406
EDITORIAL NOTES.....	416
President G. D. Humphrey	
The New President of the Southern Association	
The History of the Association	
This Issue of the QUARTERLY	

THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY

Published quarterly by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools

Volume IX

AUGUST, 1945

Number 3

BOARD OF PUBLICATION

W. J. McCONNELL, President of the Southern Association
President, North Texas State Teachers College

J. R. ROBINSON, Secretary of the Southern Association
Registrar, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee

GOODRICH C. WHITE, Secretary of Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
President, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia.

FRANK C. JENKINS, Secretary of Commission on Secondary Schools
230 Spring Street, N.W., Atlanta 3, Georgia

W. L. MAYER, Secretary of Commission on Curricular Problems and Research
Director of Registration, State College of the University of North Carolina, Raleigh

EDITOR

HOLLAND HOLTON, *Professor of Education, Duke University*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

President McConnell, Registrar Robinson, Professor Holton

Reference to the minutes of the Forty-first Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools held in Richmond, Virginia, December 3, 4, 1936, as recorded on page 24 of Volume I, Number 1 shows the following official action authorizing this publication.

Upon recommendation of the Executive Committee the Association voted to adopt the report of the Committee on Publications appointed at the fortieth annual meeting.

The Committee on Publications of the Southern Association unanimously submits the following recommendations:

1. That a Southern Association Quarterly be issued.
2. That a board of five members be held responsible for securing an editor and supervising all matters pertaining to the publication and distribution of the Quarterly. This board is to be composed of the secretaries of the three commissions, the president and the secretary-treasurer of the Association.
- 3, 4. (These sections recommended as to the character of the four issues and made appropriation for publication. See page cited above.)

In accordance with these resolutions a Board of Publication was set up, the editor elected, and the editorial committee constituted to consist of the President and the Secretary of the Association acting with the editor.

The Veteran as a Postwar Student

BY LIEUT. M. A. F. RITCHIE, USNR¹

Can the returning veteran readjust to the classroom and the campus after the excitement of battle and the regimented routine of military life? And can the college adjust to the veteran who will have educational needs different in many ways from other students on its campus?

These questions are undoubtedly much in the minds of educators at the present time. Perhaps there is no complete answer, but there are many facts that should be explored by those of us who are interested in the veteran as a postwar student and as a future community leader in the country he has fought to protect.

There is abundant evidence that veterans will go back to school in large numbers. The writer has talked to thousands of service men concerning postwar training, and he is convinced that most estimates of the prospective size of the veteran group in school after the war are not overly optimistic.

Dr. Benjamin Fine says the number going to college may reach 1,000,000!² After the First World War the re-training program enrollment reached only 178,519,³ but the program was extended only to the injured; the G. I. Bill of Rights of this war extends some measure of educational opportunity to all veterans. Willard Waller believes that not more than four per cent of service men will return to school or college without government aid, on the basis of present attitudes.⁴

In the Navy, aviation cadets are an interesting group for analysis. A survey of 400 cadets at our station shows that 74.5 per cent of those included in the survey expect to reënter academic life.

A survey by the University of Cincinnati evening college of 400 of its former students who interrupted their studies to enter the service revealed that 96 per cent of them expect to take advantage of the G. I. Bill of Rights and return to the classroom after the war. Many of the answers came from men on the fighting fronts.⁵

In March, 1945, 36,778 veterans had applied for G. I. educational benefits.⁶ Ohio colleges expect an enrollment of 36 per cent more full-time stu-

¹ The opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the viewpoint of the U. S. Navy Department. In civilian life Lieut. Ritchie is director of admissions at Roanoke College, Salem, Virginia.

² *New York Times*, November 12, 1944.

³ Dixon Wecter, *When Johnny Comes Marching Home*, Houghton-Mifflin, 1944, p. 400.

⁴ Willard Waller, *Veteran Comes Back* Drydan, 1944, p. 225.

⁵ *New York Times*, January 28, 1945.

⁶ BuPers Information Bulletin, March, 1944, p. 49.

dents than before the war.⁷ On campuses all over the country preparations are being made for a great academic homecoming for veterans.

Some may argue that the service man gets out of touch with studying and with educational activities generally. On the contrary, most service men have been in continual training from the moment they entered the service. General B. B. Somervell points out that today 68 per cent of our armed forces are technically trained.⁸

The Navy maintains 954 special schools⁹ for training technicians, while the Army maintains an even larger number. During 1943, eleven of every fourteen able-bodied men in service between the ages of 18 and 38 were students in such schools. Graduates were trained for more than a thousand different war jobs.¹⁰ In the Navy, special education officers are assigned to advanced bases all over the world.¹¹ The U. S. Armed Forces Institute which offers service men off-duty correspondence courses for self-improvement and for school credit, has an enrollment of half a million.¹²

The service man of school age is far more conditioned to the idea of advanced training being a prerequisite to success in any field than is the average high school senior. He knows the practical value of training; it has perhaps saved his life time and time again in the service. Of course, it is true that some veterans may be rusty in regard to day-to-day civilian study in preparation for college classes. For them special refresher courses should be offered, together with lectures or classes on how to study. Use of the refresher idea in the service training program has proved to be very successful. A number of the cadets in the Bunker Hill survey called for this type course to break the academic ice for them when they return to the campus.

Many educational officers in the service believe that some of the best students in colleges after the war will be veterans. Other authorities support this view. Dr. Benjamin Fine recently summarized a report on the veteran on the campus as follows: "Former service men who have returned to the college and university campus are more serious-minded than they were as civilian students, are more interested in technical and vocational courses leading to immediate jobs than they are in the humanities, do not want to be segregated into special schools or departments, and are finding it rather difficult to adjust their lives from the excitement of the battle front to the peace and quiet of the classroom."¹³ History of past wars offers support of the thesis that the veteran will be a good student once his adjustment is made. In 1865 when many Civil War veterans returned to

⁷ A survey of Ohio colleges reported in *New York Times*, April 8, 1945.

⁸ *Newsweek*, January 8, 1945.

⁹ BuPers *Information Bulletin*, March, 1944, p. 49.

¹⁰ E. E. Lewis, "Continuing Your Education in the Armed Forces," *NEA Bulletin*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 120, February 1944, p. 5.

¹¹ BuPers *Information Bulletin*, November, 1944, p. 69.

¹² Wecter, *op. cit.*, p. 527.

¹³ *New York Times*, June 4, 1944, as quoted in Waller's *Veteran Comes Back*, p. 294.

colleges in the mid-west, they were reported as having been "‘made clear-headed and more efficient by their experience of soldiering’." ¹⁴

Many former college students who were only mediocre in their studies have found new motivation in the service. Recently a young second lieutenant in the Marine Corps came to the writer for advice on returning to college. He said that he dropped out of college through lack of interest, but the service had shown him the value of an education (he had gone through cadet flight training) and he wanted to finish college. Naturally, he was urgently advised to do so, for he now has the real motivation for academic achievement. He is only typical of hundreds of others who have confessed to a new-found appreciation for training for both military and civilian success.

The veteran who returns to college will go there with a definite purpose, high expectations, and perhaps even a bit of idealization of what a higher institution of learning can do. He will need to make many adjustments to achieve his goal, but the campus is an excellent environment in which to place them.

And to enable the veteran to achieve his goal, the college which he attends will have to do some adjusting too. If it refuses, it will fail to fulfill the veteran's need; it will disillusion him of high hopes; and it will fall short in what is the greatest opportunity for service by higher education in all its history.

Most veterans who are candidates for admission will not have a previous record that will conform to the conventional pattern of units required for acceptance by many colleges. Some of these veterans never intended to go to college and took commercial courses in high school, but while in the service have acquired the ambition and/or through the G. I. Bill of Rights will have the means. Others may have dropped out of college to enter the service and now may wish to major in a field different from that pursued before the war. Over one-fourth of the cadets in the Bunker Hill study said they either will, or may wish to, change their major subject when they return to college.

Many who wish to enroll in college may have dropped out of high school at the end of their junior year. After perhaps three or possibly more years in the service, they will not want to return to high school to get the traditional units. Thousands will have an assortment of training in the various service schools and will seek credit for that training. All together these candidates for higher education will present a tangled web of problems which the college that is wedded to traditional admission patterns will be ill-fitted to solve.

The old pattern of admission requiring the candidate to present fifteen or sixteen specific high school units will not be a satisfactory criterion for

¹⁴ Wecter, *op. cit.*, p. 174.

veteran candidates. To hold the veteran candidate for college admission to this measure would be to deny the value of his Navy training and of his hard-earned knowledge of the world of men and machines. Aside from this fact, there is growing evidence that the unit requirement is not infallible as a measure of preparation for college enrollment. As W. H. Cowley, an authority in this field, pointed out in the *Educational Record* for January 1940, research has shown that *ability* and not the *amount* of secondary school training in a subject is the decisive factor in college.¹⁵

The U. S. Armed Forces Institute, Madison, Wisconsin, has developed an excellent measure of ability in the five major fields of learning usually considered basic for the candidate for college admission. It is called the "General Educational Development Test" and it measures correctness and effectiveness of expression, ability to interpret reading materials in the social studies, ability to interpret reading materials in the natural sciences, ability to interpret literary materials, and general mathematical ability.¹⁶ Additional objective tests in specific subjects are also available through the USAFI and through other sources. The writer believes, and there are many who would agree with him, that results of such tests would in most cases be a better measure for determining a candidate's fitness for admission to college and placement therein than any transcript of record of secondary school work.

One thing many veterans are worried about as they plan resumption of their studies is whether they will get any credit on the work they have done in military service schools. They, too, perhaps are thinking in terms of rigid unit requirements and are fearful that colleges and secondary schools will be loath to change traditional techniques even for the benefit of veterans.

Many admissions officials and guidance officers are likewise perhaps puzzled over just how to evaluate the veterans' in-service training in terms of high school units and college credits. The American Council on Education has furnished at least a partial solution in the form of a guidebook to the evaluation of service training.¹⁷ It lists the various service schools with the courses which the service man attending would take and then translates those courses in high school units or college credits as the case may be. The book is well arranged and should be invaluable to both high school principals and college admissions officials. Its evaluations are only recommendatory, but certainly for most schools they will be a welcome aid in the academic placement of the veteran.

Most veterans who return to the campus will want to finish their college work with the utmost dispatch. They hope for the retention, at least so

¹⁵ W. H. Cowley, "The Current Admissions Situation," *Educational Record*, Washington, D. C., American Council on Education, XXI, Supplement 13, January, 1940.

¹⁶ *Earning Secondary School Credit in the Armed Forces*, National Association of Secondary School Principals of the NEA, Washington, D. C., p. 7.

¹⁷ *A Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experiences in the Armed Services*, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1944.

far as they are concerned, of the speed-up, year-round program in vogue for the duration on most campuses. They point out that they have already lost from one to four years during which they normally would have been attending college. In the Bunker Hill study, for example, a vast majority (339) of the four hundred cadets queried were twenty years old or older. Many college students graduate at twenty, while the cadets have from one to four years of college yet to do. A twenty-two year old New Yorker puts it this way: "In view of the ages of returning service men, it seems that the present accelerated program of many universities might be maintained. Speed-up of the educational process would give the older men a better opportunity to establish themselves in business at an earlier date. Summer vacations are time lost when becoming educated is uppermost in one's mind."

The veteran will be impatient for speed not only in the college program as a whole but also in the individual courses. He has learned that many technical subjects can be taught in concentrated form, that ability to speak a foreign language can be gained by using the linguaphone system in a fraction of the time normally put on the subject in traditional college teaching. He will expect the colleges to have profited by the experience of war training. Perhaps he has read that universities such as Pennsylvania, Illinois, Harvard, Yale, Cornell, Vanderbilt, Cincinnati, Tulane, and Boston University, are making changes in their language teaching technique as a result of war experience.¹⁸ When he returns to his own campus, he will look for some similar effort.

Acting Dean E. T. Peterson of the University of Iowa reflects the growing interest of educators in wartime techniques in a recent article in which he says: "There is now emerging a disposition by all parties to face and evaluate the facts and to study the resulting implications for postwar education. This can have only one result—tremendous improvement and strengthening of postwar education."¹⁹

The veteran will be bitterly resentful of spoonfeeding in the classroom. He will not take kindly to the professor who is still lecturing from his pre-war notes. Neither will he be appreciative of the professor who speaks in terms of pure idealism without some understanding of the realistic world in which it must operate. He will be angry, for example, as Waller points out, if he "goes to his philosophy class and learns that human beings must always be treated as ends, and must never, never be treated as means; yet he knows very well that while he was a soldier he was only a means and not an end at all, and as for those who died in the war, well, that was an end of their being either an end or a means."²⁰

¹⁸ *New York Times*, November 19, 1944.

¹⁹ E. T. Peterson, "What About G. I. Education?" *Virginia Journal of Education*, November, 1944, p. 113.

²⁰ Waller, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

As never before in his academic life, the veteran who goes back to the classroom from the military service will need understanding guidance by his teachers and others who work with him. Guidance, especially vocational guidance, was the weakest point in the rehabilitation training program after the First World War.²¹ Though most progress has been made in the guidance field since that time, it is still comparatively unexplored in some educational institutions. Many educators are still confused as to what guidance or personnel work in college implies. Typical of the confusion in some institutions is the incident related by Lloyd-Jones and Smith of the college president who told an educational group that in his institution they "had not gone in for any personnel work but they had a thoroughly fine plan of counseling."²²

Of course there may be some educators who still believe that the personnel point of view in secondary school and in college should be entirely different. There may be some few who would still agree with Flexner's statement that "secondary education involves a responsibility of an intimate kind for the student, for the subject matter he studies, even for the way in which he works, lives, and conducts himself—for his manner, his morals, and his mind," but that "The university has no such complicated pattern."²³

Fortunately most forward-looking educators today do not agree with this statement but lean toward agreement with Wriston of Brown University who points out that "College is an experience both individual and social; it is intellectual, physical, emotional, spiritual. It is a time for the maturation of personality."²⁴ Or with Lowell of Harvard: "Aristotle remarked that man is by nature a social animal; and it is in order to develop his powers as a social being that American colleges exist. The object of the undergraduate department is not to produce termites, each imprisoned in the cell of his own intellectual pursuits, but men fitted to take their places in the community and live in contact with their fellow men."²⁵

Certainly the greatest thing that colleges can do for the returning veterans is just that: to see that they are "fitted to take their places in the community and live in contact with their fellow men." Instrumental in attaining that major goal, of course, is the accompanying goal of making the returned veteran a first rate doctor, lawyer, or chemist.

To achieve such goals the college needs to place at the veteran's service the best possible guidance facilities. Some educators seem to feel that the

²¹ Wecter, *op. cit.*, p. 395.

²² Esther Lloyd-Jones and Margaret Ruth Smith, *A Student Personnel Program for Higher Education*, New York, McGraw-Hill Company, 1938, p. 17.

²³ Abraham Flexner, *Universities, American, English, German*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1930, pp. 28-29, as quoted in Lloyd-Jones and Smith, *A Student Personnel Program for Higher Education*, p. 4.

²⁴ H. M. Wriston, "The Integrity of the College," *School and Society*, XLIII, No. 1102, February 8, 1936, pp. 183-193.

²⁵ A. L. Lowell, as quoted in W. H. Cowley, "The College Guarantees Satisfaction," *Educational Record*, XVI, No. 1, January, 1935, pp. 27-48.

veteran should not be noticed as such and should be treated as if he had just come from high school as other students in his classes. But the fact is that most veterans will not be in any wise identical in their thinking, study abilities, social outlook, and general degree of maturity with the non-veteran student, regardless of age.

The average veteran, though not wanting to be considered an oddity, will want to be considered just what he is: a former fighting man who has been off the campus for several years and who is *not* out of touch with training but *is* out of touch with the civilian version of training and consequently has many problems not common to other students. He will be deeply appreciative of the right kind of guidance from college officials who know something about his problems. Most colleges will have a number of faculty members who have been in the service. These faculty members can be of invaluable help in the guidance program for veterans. Regardless of other qualifications, they have a common bond of experience with the student-veteran that will win his confidence.

As has been pointed out, most veterans will seek courses that have apparent utility value. Their wartime training has been given with specific ends in view. Returning veterans will have little appreciation for many traditionally "required" courses; they will want the training that can immediately be translated into earning power. No doubt this urgency on the part of the returning veteran will prompt some colleges to reexamine their policy regarding "required" courses, and perhaps with a wholesome result. Perhaps some of them could be dropped for more immediately useful subjects; perhaps some of them have been kept in the curriculum as "must" subjects in order to insure classes for distinguished professors in those fields.

But there is danger in allowing the returned service man to abandon entirely the more cultural or more intangible subjects. Here the understanding and alert dean of instruction will play a key role in challenging the veteran with the important function of many such subjects in preparing him for postwar living. Courses in sociology, especially race relations, may have a new appeal to the former soldier or sailor who has worked and fought shoulder to shoulder with Negroes and who may have almost forgotten about the racial intolerance in his own hometown. Courses on veteran affairs and the role of veterans in American life will be of great interest to some veterans regardless of their major subject.²⁶ Student-veterans should be encouraged to study the problems and responsibilities of veterans as a group so that they may give sane and responsible postwar leadership. In many ways the languages will have a new appeal to veterans though; as has been pointed out, they will be impatient with slow, old-fashioned teaching methods. Religion, philosophy, literature, history, government, and general courses in American culture will appeal to the veteran if presented to him

²⁶ Waller, *op. cit.*, p. 307.

in a meaningful light by the kind of dean who treats him not as a child away from home for the first time but as a man who has been a leader in war and now should be prepared to be a leader of his country in peace.

The student-veteran will need discipline of the right kind, but he will resent wet-nursing. The dean of men or dean of students who deals with discipline during the postwar years on a campus with a considerable group of veterans along with the usual number of civilian students will have the challenge of his professional life. He will need to be a master of what Willard Waller calls the "art of rehabilitation."²⁷ He would do well to inform himself of the problems that confronted colleges after other wars. Even General Robert E. Lee, master handler of men, had his veteran versus non-veteran problems at Washington College (now Washington and Lee University) after the Civil War. Southern veterans who enrolled at the college after the war derisively called their younger, non-veteran classmates "yearlings."²⁸

The disciplinary techniques which produce good results with the boy or girl just out of high school will not necessarily be helpful with the veteran. In most cases, he will be older in years; in practically all cases he will be older in experience. Reports from campuses already demonstrate that the veteran feels himself older and thinks in different terms than the non-veteran student who sits next to him in class.

Deans should remember that every soldier who has seen front-line service may be at least mildly shellshocked.²⁹ Instability of temperament can be, in some cases at least, a result of shellshock rather than a deliberate desire to be a campus hell-raiser. Certain restraints that may be tolerable to the non-veteran student may cause flare-ups on the part of the veteran. The college dean who wants to deprive the veteran of his college pin-ups from *Esquire* may be subject to some of the same acid criticism that a certain government official has received from the service men in connection with certain rulings on mailing that popular magazine.

The language of the G. I. may seem a bit coarse when he returns and in some cases it may shock the Faculty Wives' Club, but it was good enough communication on the firing line. The faculty wives themselves probably thought it cute when reported in Ernie Pyle's column, but a bit out-of-place on the campus. But the fact is that you can no more make a "parlor Percy" out of a first-class fighting man in a few months than you can make a man of the world out of a graduate of Back Creek High in the same length of time.

In the matter of liquor, for example, not many veterans will want to take a voluntary pledge of campus teetotalism, for they've probably had the experience of being teetotalers from necessity at the front. But in many cases

²⁷ *Ibid*, p. 15.

²⁸ Wecter, *op. cit.*, p. 177.

²⁹ Waller, *op. cit.*, p. 53.

they will be more temperate and probably fewer problems will result from their drinking than from the drinking of non-veteran students. These are some of the things the dean will need to keep in mind, and these are some of the reasons he can't use the same disciplinary recipe on the veteran as he uses on the freshman from Ruralville High School, whose most exciting experience to date is his latest visit to the state fair.

In some colleges orientation courses for veterans and for non-veterans might be helpful in insuring a leavening of mutual understanding as a basis of avoiding clashes between the two groups. Of course, class work will never be a complete answer, nor will it replace guidance by deans and in fact by all faculty members together with key student leaders in order to insure harmony and democratic interaction of the desired kind.

But most colleges are not merely classes and lectures. They are communities within themselves with a special brand of social life which is intended to be an important factor in the education of every student. Can the veteran adjust to this life after his experience in the army or navy?

Certainly the adjustment for many will be difficult, especially for those who are in any way injured.³⁰ Of course, those who have obvious injuries will be shown the light-hearted but very real courtesy that is characteristic of American college boys and girls. It is rather the veteran with less obvious injuries who needs more fore-thought on the part of college officials.

Many student-veterans will be married; some of them will have families. In many cases the wives will not have finished college; they should be encouraged to do so and should be given all possible aid. On large campuses nursery schools may be a practical means of making class attendance possible for wives who have small children. At the University of Denver the nursery school has already been made available to service men's children.³¹

Service men and their families will be inclined to be clannish on the campus. This is a natural tendency and should be encouraged rather than discouraged, for it in itself will partially solve the social needs of this group. On some campuses apartment houses owned by universities can be made available for service men; on other campuses dormitories can be renovated into small family units. In any case, the prejudice that some colleges in years past seemed to hold against the married student is definitely out of place now if colleges are to do their job of training veterans for peacetime living.

Despite the sense of humor that has carried him through some of the grimmest experiences of the war, the average student-veteran will have little patience with a lot of the horse-play and noisy nonsense that goes under the general name of "college spirit." The freshman who is a veteran of the Leyte campaign, for example, may be a bit irked when ordered by some

³⁰ "A Wounded Veteran Gets a New Face," *Life*, p. 79, November 6, 1944, contains interesting pictorial data on a wounded veteran's adjustment to campus life.

³¹ *New York Times*, November 5, 1944.

4-F sophomore to run errands or to polish shoes, regardless of whether such tasks are campus tradition for freshmen. The veteran may smart mentally as well as physically under paddling by the "brothers" in the fraternity to which he is pledged; he may even rebel a bit at the possible social distinction ascribed by some to fraternity membership. These and many other customs peculiar to the college campus are possible causes of resentment and unrest by the veteran. In some cases he will need to be exempted from participation in particular parts of campus life; in others, through a process of give and take, a happy adjustment can be made. The influx of the veteran may in itself be a means of elimination of certain elements in campus life that are of doubtful value despite the tradition behind them.

There is one activity on the campus that is almost sure to appeal to the student-veteran, athletics. Whatever may have been the physical hardships of war, the service man has never lost his love of rough and tumble athletics. Baseball made its first great impression on the nation in the days immediately following the Civil War, and in 1865 it was hailed by the press as the "national game."³² Immediately after the war, baseball was most popular in the North, however, while in the South tournaments of "riding at the ring" were most popular.³³ Many veterans of this war will perhaps find a sort of release of war-stimulated energy and combativeness in their old-time favorites of football, boxing, basketball, and other vigorous sports.

Veterans, as has been pointed out, will bring to the campus more apparent maturity than the non-veteran; war has aged the veteran and developed some aspects of his personality. But by the same token war has robbed him of some of the experiences that bring on normal maturity in the student of college age. As Willard Waller points out, "He may know more about sex, perhaps less about love." And again: "He knows how to fight, but is less likely than the college boy to have had a satisfactory work experience."³⁴ He, therefore, is in as great or greater need of guidance along these vital lines than the non-veteran.

Many veterans are worried about marital readjustment if they are already married, or the initial adjustment if they are returning to the "girl they left behind." Wisely taught courses on marriage and the family may be of great help, for in many cases the married couples are really living together in normal fashion for the first time since they took the vows. Of course, class lectures cannot take the place of wise personal guidance by the proper kind of deans and guidance officials. Many colleges which have never introduced courses on marriage and the family can now do so, for they will have a more urgent need than ever before with which to convince an ultra-conservative board of trustees or faculty committee on course of study.

A placement bureau is always a useful part of the personnel services pro-

³² Wecter, *op. cit.*, p. 218.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 220.

³⁴ Waller, *op. cit.*, p. 152.

vided by colleges, but it will have particular importance to the veteran who is finishing college. In some instances, for example, its greatest service will be that of steering him away from the job (if any) he had before the war, because he may now be fitted for something better. In all instances, it can be a useful clearing house of information to insure him the best possible job to engage his talents as well as to give him a fair measure of security. Well-educated veterans well-placed in positions of trust in communities all over the land will be America's best insurance against another bonus march or other violence resulting from veteran unrest.

Everett V. Perkins recently said in a magazine article that the greatest word in education is *influence*. As he explained it, "Influence from its derivation means 'to flow into.' It is the knowledge, the ideals, the spirit, which flow from the life of the teacher into the life of the child."³⁵ Those of us who agree with Lowell's definition of the mission of a university previously quoted, would say that Professor Perkins' statement is a good one. And certainly at no time has the college or university been called upon more urgently to bring its choicest influence to bear in a cause more worthy than educating veterans for postwar living. The college, if it does a good job, can influence veterans for roles of crucial service in the postwar period; if it does a poor job, it may breed in intelligent minds the bitterness and unrest that will be the seeds of "isms" that can wreck the democracy we have fought to protect.

Whatever may be its shortcomings, the college or school is the best place for the rehabilitation of the younger veteran into civilian life. Here he can be encouraged to express his grievances without fear of being fired. Here he can argue and discuss until he regains the mastery of words for civilian purposes. Here, in at least the better schools, he can follow a training program designed for his particular needs. Here he can have a chance to recover his emotional balance. Here he can look at the veteran's own postwar problems in an objective fashion. Here, better than any place else, he can fit himself with a set of new attitudes that will be among his most important tools for civil life. Here he will have his best chance to find himself and his role in the life of his country.

The veteran as a postwar student will bring many problems to the campus. But he will bring to American education the greatest opportunity for service in its history, and the chances are the veteran will thereby make our schools and colleges greater American institutions.

³⁵ Everett Perkins, "The Biggest Word in Education," *The Journal of Education*, October, 1944, p. 233.

Basil Manly, Frederick A. P. Barnard, and the University of Alabama Curriculum Inquiry, 1852-1854

ELBERT VAUGHAN WILLS

Procurement Division Building, Washington, D. C.

During the half century preceding the Civil War, there were numerous and varied efforts looking toward the elaboration of the curriculum of the American college or the introduction of elective studies or parallel courses or curricula in order to meet more effectually the needs of the time for practical training. At the University of Alabama, these circumstances brought about an inquiry which occasioned two reports, one of which has become well known and has been hailed as a document of fundamental importance in the evolution of the American college curriculum, while the other has attracted little attention and, indeed, has been often overlooked by those who have dealt with the subject to which it is germane. It is worthwhile, therefore, that the circumstances occasioning the inquiry be reviewed and the nature and scope of the two reports summarized.

By the close of the colonial period, the American college curriculum, consisting essentially of the classical languages, mathematics, natural philosophy, and moral philosophy, had assumed a general uniformity. Following the Revolution, there came into play a group of influences operating to bring about the expansion of this uniform cultural curriculum. On the one hand, there were voiced demands for a foreshortening of the period of preparation for life and the concentration of educational endeavor upon subjects of instruction having an immediate application to the practical needs of life. This demand was diversified in its scope and widespread in its ramifications. On the part of those who spoke for the needs of the tillers of the soil, it took the form of emphasis upon training in agriculture. The growing importance of manufactures intensified the need for practical preparation for mechanical vocations. The extended scope of this two-fold demand may be inferred from the fact that the land-grant colleges established under the first Morrill Act of 1862 were often designated, in terms of the phraseology of the act, as "agricultural and mechanical" colleges. At the same time there was growing up in the more important urban centers a demand for a type of higher education ministering more directly to the needs of the secular-professional and commercial classes than did the regimen of the traditional college. This movement eventuated in the rise of privately-controlled urban institutions such as New York University and in an interesting though unsuccessful effort on the part of J. D. B. De Bow and his as-

sociates to develop at the old University of Louisiana (now Tulane University) a prototype of the modern university school of commerce. Here, too, may be found in large measure the germ of the municipal college and university movement. These practical demands, coupled with the heritage coming down from the realism and encyclopaedism of the seventeenth century, operated to produce what David Starr Jordan has termed the "patch-work stage" in the development of the American college curriculum. This was characterized by the multiplication of subjects in a required curriculum which resulted in a marked overcrowding of the course of study. At the same time there was a noteworthy development of practical, special, or parallel courses in the older institutions and an expansion of the elective system, which had been foreshadowed by Jefferson in his reorganization of the College of William and Mary in 1779, and which became the distinctive feature of the organization of the University of Virginia when that institution opened its doors in 1825. Likewise there appeared several independent technical schools.

These influences making for the modification of the traditional college curriculum were opposed by a group of conservative tendencies which operated to keep in effect the regimen of the uniform classical curriculum. One of these was the disorganization resulting from the Revolutionary War, which operated for a considerable period to retard educational development at all levels. Secondly, there was the tradition of stability among institutions of higher education as to the requirements for degrees. A third factor was the tradition of the cultural and disciplinary function of the college course. Finally, the uniform classical curriculum and the doctrine of the disciplinary function of higher education were defended in a group of polemical writings, some of which exerted a marked influence in opposition to change. Of these documents the most widespread in its effect as a conservative factor was probably the *Reports on the Course of Instruction in Yale College; by a Committee of the Corporation and the Academical Faculty*, which appeared in 1828. This document was made up of a report of the faculty, the first section of which was written by President Day and the second by James L. Kingsley, professor of ancient languages at Yale, and a report of a committee of the corporation prepared by Governor Tomlinson. It defended the traditional curriculum of required studies having as its core a thorough grounding in the classical languages. This defense rested, first, upon the disciplinary value of training in the classics and, secondly, upon the knowledge value of the subject-matter of the course as "furniture of the mind."

To the same general body of apologetic for the uniform classical curriculum belong the reports with which we are here concerned, namely, those by Basil Manly and Frederick A. P. Barnard in connection with the University of Alabama curriculum inquiry of 1852-1854.

The University of Alabama, a state institution, was established in 1831. Its early organization was guided largely by its first head, the Rev. Alva Woods, a graduate of Harvard trained in theology at Andover Seminary, a former professor in Columbian College (now George Washington University), Washington, D. C., and at Brown University, who had served from 1828 to 1831 as president of Transylvania University, Kentucky, and came to the presidency of the University of Alabama in March, 1831. After an administration the inherent difficulties of which were complicated and intensified by unpopularity arising from his anti-slavery opinions, Woods resigned in December, 1837. His successor was Basil Manly, a graduate of South Carolina College, and, like Woods, a clergyman of the Baptist Church, who served from 1838 to 1855.

The architecture of the original buildings of the University of Alabama, which were destroyed during the Civil War, was influenced to a marked degree by that of the University of Virginia. The influence of Jefferson's elective system upon the Alabama institution, as well as upon other colleges and universities throughout the South, gradually made itself felt in the face of the strongly intrenched tradition of the fixed curriculum.

As a means of securing comprehensive information as to the comparative merits of the elective system, on the one hand, and, on the other, the traditional curriculum of four years of study of required subjects for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, the trustees of the University of Alabama requested President Manly to visit the principal American colleges and universities, to study their curricular organization and instructional methods, and to present to the board at its next regular meeting, a report with recommendation as to whether any changes "in the system of education pursued in the University are necessary and proper, in order to extend the benefits of the Institution to a greater number of the citizens of the State."

In gathering the data for his report, Manly was assisted by Landon Cabell Garland, then a professor in the University of Alabama, who later succeeded Manly as president of the institution and subsequently became the first chancellor of Vanderbilt University. Manly's report, which he characterizes as "a compilation of facts and views" which came within reach of himself and his colleague in the course of a hurried journey in August and September, 1851, was presented to the board of trustees and was published in 1852 under the title, *Report on Collegiate Education, Made to the Trustees of the University of Alabama, July, 1852*.

The Yale report of 1828 had, as we have seen, stressed first the disciplinary value of the training afforded by the classical curriculum, and, secondly, the knowledge value of a grounding in principles as a preparation for professional study or for life work.

Manly likewise defended the classical curriculum of required studies, stressed the importance of maintaining a uniform significance for the college

diploma, and set forth the aim of character-building in higher education in terms which suggest the probability of the influence of the Yale report. His argument is noteworthy, first for his emphasis upon the importance of stability to an institution of learning and his recognition of the danger from too-ready accommodation to popular demands. A second point of primary significance is his clear formulation of the cultural aim of college training. "Colleges must not," he says, "be *echoes* of the popular humor—but *influences*—to train, to educate, to evoke from its slumbers, or recall from its vagaries, the very spirit of the land."

In considering these early conceptions of education as discipline, it should be borne in mind that the meanings attached to the term at various periods in the history of education have shown significant variations. In connection with the greatly stimulated interest in the sciences which came toward the end of the nineteenth century in America, and the spread of the elective system in colleges and universities, the old subjects of the classics and mathematics were defended against the new on the ground of formal discipline, the theory, that is, that through application in one field, there may be developed mental power usable in any other department of activity. The advocates of the new subjects, likewise, sought to justify them on the basis of their disciplinary value. At the period with which we are concerned, the significance attached to discipline in connection with the college curriculum was somewhat different. It seems erroneous to conclude, as Snow does, that in terms of the reasoning of which the Yale report is the best example, "The college curriculum is a drill, not a means of culture. Minds are to be formed by the one pattern and characters fashioned by one uniform mold" (Louis Franklin Snow, *The College Curriculum in the United States*, New York, 1907, p. 142). Governor Tomlinson's emphasis upon training in principles and upon well-rounded development would indicate an underlying thought that this very discipline was cultural. Manly, however, is more explicit on the bearing of educative effort. He thought of the college as a republic of letters, where the student, through the effort required for the mastery of the classical curriculum, attained, on the one hand, command of language, and, on the other, the sharpening of his powers by intercourse with master minds. Similarly, in his study of pure mathematics, he was made acquainted with those universal mathematical laws through the application of which nature is brought under the control of man. "All subjects in Education," he says, "are *instruments*, not *ends*; and their value is to be estimated by their bearing, first and mainly, *on education*; and through that chiefly on practical life."

Manly's emphasis upon culture led him to the view that upon Southern institutions of higher education there rested a special responsibility in the teaching of the youth of the planter class who, under the system then prevailing, could look forward to a life of comparative leisure. Leisure with-

out liberal culture he considered a curse. Manly advocated a curriculum having as its substratum a thorough grounding in the classical languages and mathematics. In addition he would include the sciences and their applications to life. "It would seem but rational to conclude," he continues, "that the first thing is to *subdue and train the faculties*." For attaining this end he finds no adequate substitute for the classical languages and mathematics. "The proper object of collegiate education," we read, "is the knowledge of principles and causes, rather than of facts, which belongs to a specific or professional education."

Passing in review a number of institutions which had introduced special or parallel courses, and pointing out the slight measure of success which had attended the ventures in this direction, Manly called attention to what was undoubtedly a prime factor making for the persistence of the fixed curriculum, namely, the social stigma attached to the irregular course. "The partial course," he says, "humbles a man with a consciousness of his deficiency when he enters it. It affords him but little of encouragement or animation while he is in it. And it brands him with a palpable mark of deficiency and inferiority when he comes out."

While Manly's conclusions were adverse to the introduction of the elective system at the University of Alabama, the trustees of the institution decided, nevertheless, to adopt the system in a somewhat modified form. The faculty of the university was requested to prepare a plan of reorganization to effect a change in the system of instruction designed to afford to the student a greater measure of freedom in the choice of his studies. The committee of the faculty appointed for the purpose of developing this plan was headed by Frederick Augustus Porter Barnard, at that time professor of chemistry and natural history in the University of Alabama. Barnard, a native of Massachusetts and a graduate of Yale, where he served as an instructor, was a member of the faculty of the University of Alabama from 1837 to 1854. In the latter year he became professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in the University of Mississippi. He headed that institution as its president from 1856 to 1858 and as chancellor from 1858 to 1861. Leaving the South after the outbreak of the Civil War, he assumed, in 1864, the presidency of Columbia College in New York. Here he served until 1888 and was largely instrumental in paving the way for the expansion of the institution into the great university which it has since become.

In connection with the discharge of the duty which had been assigned to them, the majority of the committee, consisting of Barnard and the Rev. John W. Pratt, professor of English Literature in the University, formulated a report which was the work of Barnard and which was published in 1855 under the title, *Report on a Proposition to Modify the Plan of Instruction in the University of Alabama, Made to the Faculty of the University. Read Before the Faculty, Sept. 21, and Before the Board of Trustees, Sept. 26, 1854.* This docu-

ment examined in detail the elective system and presented an able argument in favor of the required curriculum to which all students who were regular candidates for graduation should be required to conform. In its main positions this report accorded closely with that previously presented by Manly. There were extended citations of instances of the unsatisfactory operation of similar projects, exposition of the fallacy of the plan, and marshaling of the opinions of educators against it.

Under the plan adopted by the trustees of the University, which represented a measure of compromise, the system of four classes was continued, but students not members of a regular class were allowed to pursue the subjects estimated to be the most efficacious in enabling them to attain the objects for which they had come to the University. After this plan had been in operation for three years, there was a reversion to the fixed curriculum. This was followed, in 1859, by a renewed trend toward an elective system resembling that of the University of Virginia. This development, however, was halted by the vicissitudes of the Civil War.

Barnard's report has been hailed as an illustration of the widespread influence of the Yale report of 1828. Snow, in his dissertation, observes that "F. A. P. Barnard, though a graduate of an earlier day, was of the Governing Board of Yale when the Report was issued. His educational ideas were strongly biased by this publication as the history of his career in Alabama in the Memoir of his Life shows" (p. 145). In this connection it should be observed that Barnard, during his later career at Columbia, became a pronounced advocate of the elective system.

In his University of Alabama report, Barnard adverted to and expressed agreement with the earlier work of Manly. In December, 1858, however, Henry Barnard published in his *American Journal of Education* (Vol. V, pp. 753-780) a biographical sketch of Frederick A. P. Barnard in which the Alabama curriculum report presented by the latter in 1854 was dealt with in some detail without connecting it with Manly's earlier investigation in the same field. Reliance upon secondary accounts has apparently contributed to the recognition of Barnard and the ignoring of Manly in this connection. At all events, Manly's report should be rescued from the undeserved neglect into which it has fallen and set in its proper relation to the episode in the history of the University of Alabama of which it formed a significant part.

Trinity College, 1839-1892: The Beginnings of Duke University

BY NORA CAMPBELL CHAFFIN

Dean of Women, Vanderbilt University

What makes man, the human machine, function physically and mentally has been a fascinating puzzle for people in every age of recorded history. He was fashioned out of the material and climate of his past and endowed with a will to live. His creations are in his own mental image; he knows no other.

An institution, as a segment of the collective personality of man's past, comes to reflect fragments of his heritage. So it was with the educational institution that found continuity through Brown's Schoolhouse, Union Institute, Normal College, and Trinity College, located in a rural community in northwestern Randolph County, North Carolina. Together these simple schools made up an institutional organism with a will to survive. In their beginning and development they were American homespun; only remotely could they claim relationship to their European predecessors.

Even so, ideas native to other continents were found in the rural community that produced Brown's Schoolhouse. European philosophy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Declaration of Independence, the American Bill of Rights, and Jacksonian Democracy helped to open the doors of Brown's Schoolhouse and similar community schools throughout the land during the 1830's. People must have equality of opportunity; children must be taught to read and write; and any boy in the Union might become the President of the United States. The sixty-odd girls and boys who usually gathered annually at Brown's Schoolhouse were led by their schoolmasters to give the climate of their minds to the community, as they learned reading and writing and arithmetic.

By 1839 mere tools of learning had become insufficient for children whose parents were experiencing widening intellectual horizons. Denominational spirit was strong in the neighborhood made up largely of Methodists and Quakers, but community spirit was stronger. Preachers, teachers, farmers, and planters became convinced that youth must be better trained for places of responsibility. This conviction expressed a part of the continued story of American life. When the economic and social development of rural communities furnished the necessary support for more advanced educational institutions, the community school sometimes grew into an academy with Latin, Greek, science, and philosophy added to the curriculum.

In 1839 the Reverend Brantley York, a self-educated Methodist preacher

and roving schoolmaster, followed this educational pattern familiar to his generation. He led the community in a movement to expand the subscription school at Brown's Schoolhouse into an academy, Union Institute. Two years later the school was incorporated as a private institution under the laws of North Carolina.

After serving as principal of the Academy for nearly three years, York resigned and recommended the Reverend Braxton Craven as his successor. Craven, a former student at Union Institute and later York's nineteen-year-old assistant, was thereupon elected principal. Craven, like York, was a native of Randolph County, a Methodist minister, and largely self-educated. He had studied for a brief period at New Garden School; and several years later, after becoming prominent in the educational and literary world, he received the honorary degree of Bachelor of Arts from Randolph Macon College, and still later, he was awarded degrees from other educational institutions. From 1842 until his death in 1882, Craven served as the guiding genius of the school that eventually became Trinity College.

He was essentially a product of the American belief that a citizen of lowly birth and meager educational opportunity could rise by his own efforts to become a respected leader in his state. He expressed his confidence in this belief by emphasizing public education and by providing self-help opportunities for needy youth.

In all of his efforts for the school, Craven **received** encouragement and support from leaders of the community. **They** furnished the land and erected the buildings for Union Institute; Craven gave the inspiration and energy necessary to bring about improvements and to make the academy self-supporting and progressive in its outlook.

Between 1840 and 1850, Union Institute grew in influence beyond the limits of the original community of Brown's Schoolhouse. Gradually becoming a school exclusively for boys, the institution enrolled more than eight hundred during the twelve-year period of its history as an academy. Students came in increasing numbers from many counties of North Carolina, and from three other states—Virginia, South Carolina, and Missouri. As there were no dormitories, the students lived in the homes of the community. Families moved to the vicinity of the school, and a village began to grow up around the two-room frame building that housed the Academy. There, Craven, with the assistance of a few student helpers, instructed the youth who gathered around him. He taught them to be conscious of the social and economic affairs of their day, and the students discussed these problems in the classroom and in their newly organized literary club, the Columbian Literary Society. Within five years the boys from the western part of the State were encouraged to organize a rival club—the Hesperian Literary Society. Both continued to be the most influential student organizations until after the Duke endowment was created.

Keenly aware of the social trends of his time, Craven, like other well-informed Southerners, sensed the growing economic and literary dependence of the South upon the North. He consequently advocated the establishment of Southern newspapers, magazines, publishing houses, and manufacturing establishments. He joined with another young man in establishing a short-lived literary magazine to which he contributed articles, stories, and novels. The favorite theme of his published works was better educational advantages for the plain people of the South.

By 1840 North Carolina had enacted a public school law; and although it left much to be desired, the law represented an attempt to provide statewide educational opportunities for children. Efficiently operated public schools required well-trained teachers, and there were few in North Carolina. Greatly concerned about this problem, Craven determined to concentrate his efforts toward persuading the State to establish a school for the training of teachers. In printed articles and public addresses, he discussed the needs of the public schools and urged the State to provide for teacher-training. After studying American and European normal schools, he described these institutions and experimented with teacher-training at Union Institute. He organized a normal course and conducted a "model school" at the Academy.

By 1850 Craven was convinced that the time had come for the establishment of a training school in North Carolina. Members of the community of Union Institute, trustees of the Academy, and leaders in the State were also convinced of this need. At the General Assembly of 1850, Craven sponsored the introduction of a bill providing for the conversion of Union Institute into a teacher-training school. A bitter controversy ensued; but in January, 1851, the General Assembly enacted a charter providing for the conversion of Union Institute into Normal College, a teacher-training institution anomalously affiliated with North Carolina but not supported financially by the State. The next General Assembly provided for further expansion of Normal. Added to the right of issuing state teachers' certificates to students trained at Normal, were the power to confer degrees and the opportunity to borrow \$10,000 from the State Literary Fund. The governor of the State became ex-officio chairman of a self-perpetuating board of trustees; and the State superintendent of common schools, ex-officio secretary to the board.

Convinced of an unusual opportunity for public service, Craven organized his teacher-training school. With much difficulty, he secured the loan of \$10,000 from the State Literary Fund, and he used this sum to erect and equip a three-story brick building containing classrooms, a library, literary society halls, laboratories, and a few dormitory rooms. The first full-time professors and instructors were employed—all educated either at Union Institute or Normal College. Students came in increasing numbers from

North Carolina and other states, and in 1853 the first students received degrees from Normal. Women were not officially admitted as students; but when they proved their ability and training, the College issued them teachers' certificates. The village around Normal grew rapidly, and nearby plank roads brought both students and visitors from many places in the South.

Adjusted to meet many demands, the curriculum included everything from subjects taught in primary school through those required for college degrees. Special courses, limited in scope, were arranged for teachers who did not graduate but were given teachers' certificates. Other courses were organized to meet the needs of a general or professional education without fulfilling the requirements for either certificate or degree. Such an expansive curriculum, without sufficient instructional staff and teaching equipment, tended to sacrifice efficient training in every course offered.

The obvious defects of Normal stimulated criticism and added to Craven's increasing worries. His every effort to win financial aid from the State was rebuffed by powerful political opponents who ridiculed his educational experiment. The University of North Carolina, long the financially unsupported favorite of the State, hardly noticed Craven's efforts to win its favor.

He soon found that it was well-nigh impossible to cope with his powerful opponents and critics. They accused Normal of shoddy work, as they described teachers, poorly trained at Normal, given state certificates, and permitted to teach in the public schools. They compared these ill-prepared youths with the well-equipped graduates of other collegiate institutions. Much of this criticism Craven admitted to be true, and he realized that the College could do little better with its limited teaching force and equipment. He stood in desperate need of financial help if he were to improve his school, subsisting on meager fees from students. After five years of unsuccessful effort to enlist the aid of the State, he became convinced that he would receive no further financial assistance from that source.

At this time Craven was aware of the current upsurge of denominational activity in establishing schools and colleges throughout the United States. Wake Forest and Davidson Colleges represented the efforts of the Baptists and Presbyterians in North Carolina. These and other denominations sponsored academies and female seminaries, but there were no other liberal arts denominational colleges in the State. One of the largest churches in point of numbership was the Methodist, but it had no college for men. Since 1830 Methodism in North Carolina had joined with that in Virginia in the support of Randolph-Macon College.

In 1856 Craven, sorely in need of a financial sponsor for Normal, sensed a new opportunity for the College. He was a local minister and member of the North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.

Moreover, for a few years he had been educating candidates for the ministry free of charge at Normal. After consulting influential churchmen, he became convinced that the time was ripe for a proposition to the North Carolina Conference. In 1856 he offered Normal College and its control to the Conference in return for the sum of \$25,000, of which \$10,000 was to be used to pay the old debt to the State Literary Fund. At this time the Methodists were inclined favorably to the proposition because of strained relationship with Randolph-Macon College. This unfortunate situation resulted from a personal feud which had existed between Charles Force Deems, a prominent member of the North Carolina Conference, and the Reverend William A. Smith, president of Randolph-Macon. Craven had sympathized with Deems in the controversy, and later Deems and his friends gave Craven's proposition their support. After some hesitation, the Conference decided to adopt Normal as its "male" college, and agreed to raise the sum as outlined in Craven's offer.

A new charter legalized this action. The teacher-training feature of the College curriculum was abolished; a self-perpetuating board of trustees responsible to the Conference was provided; gambling devices and intoxicants were forbidden within two miles of the campus;* and the name of Normal was changed to Trinity in honor of the college by the same name in Cambridge, England. The new name had been suggested by Deems and approved by Craven, who wished to abolish any stigma which might cling to the term Normal.

Craven and the Methodists of North Carolina turned enthusiastically to the development of a liberal arts college at Trinity. Between the years 1856 and 1860 the United States, alternately prosperous and financially depressed, was deeply stirred by humanitarian reformers. These conditions were reflected at the College. Students entered from ten of the Southern states, and the annual enrollment gradually climbed above two hundred. More people moved to the village in order to educate their children and to engage in business; moreover, the little town became a pleasant summer resort.

The curriculum was revised, although it continued to include practically anything one wished to study. More instructors were employed, and the first professor educated at a college other than Union Institute, Normal, or Trinity was added to the faculty.

Student extra-curricular activities increased. New organizations took their places among the old societies and clubs; publications appeared; student interest in national and state problems grew; and age-old pranks of youth caused both amusement and disciplinary measures at the College.

Prosperous and growing, the College emphasized education as a serious

* Similar provisions were common in chartering state-supported schools and even common schools as well as denominational academics and colleges.—EDITOR.

business, and its stated policy was "to make men." As in former years, students came largely from the ranks of the plain people, and "indigent" but ambitious youth were invited to come to Trinity to be educated.

In 1860 the College made further plans for expansion. New buildings were to be erected, an endowment raised, college publications extended, and more men added to the faculty. Furthermore, the North Carolina Conference planned to complete the payment of its obligation incurred for the College. During the years 1860-1862 these plans were all abandoned.

Throughout the United States the politicians and reformers had their way, and attempted secession of the South blazed into open war. Craven, along with students and others at Trinity, did not favor secession, and he lent his influence toward keeping North Carolina loyal to the United States. However, when the State finally passed the ordinance of secession, he and his friends at Trinity gave their allegiance to the Confederacy.

Craven foresaw the tragedy of the conflict; and acutely aware of what it would mean to Trinity, he took immediate measures to protect the institution. All plans for expansion were cancelled, and employees of the College agreed to accept *pro rata* whatever the institution might earn in the future. To keep the students at school, Craven organized a military company, the Trinity Guard, which under the laws of the State, was used to quell local disturbances.

Late in 1860 Craven was appointed captain in command of the Confederate prison at Salisbury. He and the Trinity Guard took up their duties, and served there for a few weeks. Because of military politics, Craven was relieved of his command; and he and his company of students returned to their academic and military duties at Trinity.

There the students did not remain long; various Confederate drafts together with many volunteers drew most of them into the army. The sad plight that faced other schools in the South also faced Trinity during the succeeding years. Fortunately Craven and most of his faculty were farmers as well as teachers. When income from the College failed, they continued to make a bare living from their gardens and farms.

Added to the distress of war and its blighting effects upon the College, were attacks upon Craven. Former supporters now turned upon him and the College. They accused him of bad faith and inefficiency in the management of Trinity; and when they could not prove their accusations, they persuaded the North Carolina Conference to give its support to another institution, Olin High School. After this decision, friends of Trinity persuaded the Conference to suspend all action in reference to its educational institutions until the close of the war.

In 1863 Craven, hurt by the accusation of his enemies and convinced that he had done all that he could for Trinity, resigned his position as president of the College. He accepted an appointment as pastor of the Eden-

ton Street Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in Raleigh; and held this position until the close of the war.

During this time, he continued his support of the College and proved his loyalty to its interests. In 1864 when the officers of the State Literary Fund invited debtors to pay their obligations in Confederate currency, Craven out of his own personal means paid the old debt of \$10,000 that Trinity had owed the Fund since the days of Normal College. By this act, he practically freed the College from debt, and at the same time met the obligation accepted by the North Carolina Conference as a part payment for the control of Trinity. By paying the old debt, Craven once more virtually controlled the property of the College.

Upon the resignation of Craven, W. T. Gannaway, professor of Latin and Greek, was chosen president *pro tempore*. As the number of students gradually sank almost to a vanishing point, one by one the members of the faculty, who did not join the army, resigned their positions. Gannaway alone became president, faculty, business manager, and, in fact, the whole staff of the College. When it seemed as if the College must surely close its doors because there were no students to teach, Gannaway took a radical step. In 1864, he officially admitted young women as students, and that year fifteen or twenty studied in his classroom.

The academic years of 1864 and 1865 were the times of greatest hardship. Tuition was paid in kind; food was expensive and hard to get at any price; and no new books or paper could be found. Such were the conditions at Trinity in April, 1865, when retreating Confederate soldiers encamped upon the College campus. Surrender was in the air and excitement prevailed. It was impossible "to keep school," and Gannaway closed the doors of the College. When surrender finally came, the college community in great sadness joined in the military ceremony of lowering the Confederate flag from its pole in front of Craven's home on the campus.

Trinity was closed because of the results of war, but not for long. Late in 1865 the trustees of the College and the North Carolina Conference decided that they must renew their educational efforts. Olin High School and its assets had been swept away by the war. Enthusiastically the Conference and trustees turned to Trinity. Urged by these officials to resume his former position as president, Craven reluctantly consented. When he had resigned two years previously, he declared that he would never again fill the position; but in 1865 he could not see the College for which he had labored so long remain permanently closed. Furthermore, he mistakenly believed that the old opposition to him and Trinity had died out. His decision to return to the College was further influenced by the fact that though stricken by war, Trinity was freer from debt to everyone except to himself than it had been since the days of Union Institute.

When Craven returned to prepare for the re-opening of Trinity, he found

much to discourage him. The college building was in urgent need of repair; and most of the furniture, books, and other equipment had disappeared. The village of Trinity was as destitute of supplies as the College; boarding-houses and business concerns had little or no capital for the resumption of business. At the expense of his own personal means and manual labor, Craven managed to prepare for the re-opening of the College. Still lacking many necessities, Trinity, once more a college exclusively for men, opened its doors in January, 1866.

From that date until Craven's death in 1882, Trinity in its successes and disappointments reflected the struggles of the State and its region. Before political reconstruction came to North Carolina, Craven gave his influence and that of the College to the support of leaders who sought social readjustment and economic recovery for the State. When these Conservative leaders were defeated, he joined with them in their efforts to release the commonwealth from the thralldom of political reconstruction. Before and after the resumption of "home rule," Craven gave his influence further to the rebuilding of the religious, literary, and economic interests of the State.

Trinity felt keenly the periods of economic turmoil that revolved throughout the land during these years. Student enrollment and college finances, as well as the curriculum and student opinion, reflected these conditions. Regardless of every change, Craven held fast to his belief in the education of the plain people. He expressed his conviction by aiding needy students, by supporting an improved public school system, and by helping to reopen the University of North Carolina. Added to these efforts was the beginning of a summer school for teachers at Trinity and attempts to establish Methodist preparatory schools throughout the State.

For a few years Trinity regained some of its former prosperity, and a steady increase in enrollment and in additions to the faculty continued until the seventies. The physical plant was remodeled and improved by easily obtained loans. Financial problems were met satisfactorily, and the curriculum was revised to meet current trends in science and technology.

During the 1870's this growth and expansion received a severe check because of financial distress throughout the land, bickering within the North Carolina Conference, renewed attacks upon Craven, and the re-opening and growing popularity of the University of North Carolina. Craven tried desperately to stem the forces that threatened to crush the College. As early as 1866 he raised the question of the removal of the College to some other place which might bring Trinity more support. Vainly he appealed to the Peabody Fund for aid. Plans and activities for the endowment of the College brought meager results. The governing boards of Trinity gave verbal support but would do nothing that would involve them financially. The enrollment of the College shrank rapidly. Charles Force Deems, now nationally known as pastor of the Church of the Strangers in New York

and friend of Cornelius Vanderbilt, led a faction in the North Carolina Conference in renewed attacks upon Trinity and its president; and personal animosities and ambitions wove an entangling mesh of hindrances and discouragements about the College. Amid these trials Craven sensed forces that were at work for Trinity. He watched with satisfaction the growing power and influence of the alumni; for upon these and other friends he could depend for help when other efforts failed.

He allowed neither financial hardship nor personal criticism to prevent his taking steps for the welfare of the students and College. In a day when higher education for "females" was questioned, Craven permitted women to study privately at the College and sponsored the first academic degrees to be issued to women at any college for men in North Carolina. Although severely pressed for funds, he managed to aid impecunious young men; and with the financial help of friends in Durham, he provided for the training of the first recorded oriental student in North Carolina—the distinguished Chinese, Charles J. Soong.

By 1880 the College had again reached a critical period in its history. Two years later, Craven, tired, diseased, and wounded by criticism, died suddenly at the beginning of a new academic year at Trinity.

With the passing of Braxton Craven, critics of the College prophesied its complete collapse; but friends and alumni rallied to its support. The next ten years were most difficult, and often it seemed as if the College would disappear like many others throughout the South. Instead, clinging to the perpetuating forces of its past and struggling to gain the invigorating support of current society, the institution managed somehow to surmount every obstacle in its struggle for survival.

Immediately following the death of Craven, the old administrative regime of the College was continued for two years under the leadership of two distinguished alumni of the College. W. H. Pegram, professor of natural science, was chosen chairman of the faculty until the election of the Reverend Marquis L. Wood to the presidency in 1883. Pegram, a native of Harnett County, North Carolina, had served the College in some capacity since his days as a student at Trinity. Wood was born, reared, and educated in Randolph County. A member of the North Carolina Conference, he had served pastorates in the State until 1860, when he was sent to China as the first missionary from the Conference. Six years later, he returned to his former duties in the State. He was a devoted friend of Craven and, as a member of the Board of Trustees, had long brooded over the welfare of Trinity.

The trials which had often burdened Craven now troubled Wood. Within a year and a half, he became convinced of his inability to cope advantageously with the problems of the College; and he resigned in December, 1884. His action was hastened by the decision of the trustees and the North Caro-

lina Conference to give Trinity into the hands of a Committee of Management for the next two years. By this action Trinity became definitely connected with the new economic forces arising from the ashes of the Old South.

During his many years as administrator, Craven had become convinced that the future welfare of Trinity was dependent upon the active support of a growing body of loyal alumni and friends. This conviction became a reality during the years that followed his death. The Committee of Management, all members of the Board of Trustees, was composed of two former students of Trinity, J. W. Alspaugh and James A. Gray, and a well-known Methodist manufacturer, Julian S. Carr. These three men, grasping opportunities for new industrial development, had become prominent leaders of substantial means in the economic life of North Carolina. As loyal Methodists, they had contributed generously to the church in its various activities. Now, when Trinity was facing virtual collapse, the three men proposed to assume responsibility for the College, guarantee a sum of money for its operation, and administer the College; provided the North Carolina Conference agreed to raise a specified sum of money each year. Their conditions accepted, the Committee of Management took over the administration of the College.

Energetically, the new Committee assumed its duties. J. F. Heitman, professor of Greek, was chosen chairman of the faculty and entrusted with delegated executive duties. Able young specialists, including Henry Horace Williams, were elected to the faculty; revision was made in the curriculum; and the enrollment began to creep upward.

Already committed to the cause of an endowment for Trinity, the Committee of Management was further convinced of this need by their experience as administrators. When the North Carolina Conference failed to fulfill its financial agreement with the Committee, the Management decided that the College must be endowed immediately. Trinity could not long survive depending financially upon its timeworn practice of adjusting its educational program to meager fees from students and to uncertain donations from friends.

A small bequest for an endowment had been made by a friend during the administration of Marquis L. Wood. Now, Alspaugh and Carr decided to give further impetus to an endowment. They proposed to match dollar for dollar a specified sum to be subscribed by the Methodists of the State. In order to encourage immediate action, they placed a time limit on their offer. With some enthusiasm, Methodism accepted the proposition and made efforts to raise the sum. Again the Church failed, and the plan was abandoned. The idea of an endowment continued, however, and its necessity was urged among the people of the State.

At the end of their two-year period of management, Alspaugh, Carr, and Gray relinquished their control. Despite the fact that the North Carolina

Conference failed to fulfill its financial agreement with the Committee, the three men discharged in full their financial obligations as well as their executive duties. A serious crisis in the history of the College had been safely passed because of the generosity of Alspaugh, Carr, and Gray.

In relinquishing their executive control of the College, the Committee of Management declared that two imperative needs faced Trinity: (1) an adequate endowment, and (2) a new president. Although discouraged by the unwillingness of the Methodists to allow their "wealthy laymen" to carry practically unassisted the financial and executive burdens of the College, the Committee, as members of the Board of Trustees, pledged their continued aid in meeting the needs of the College. Generously they agreed to serve with other members of a new committee appointed by the trustees to outline a workable plan designed to raise an endowment and to secure a new president for the College.

Early in 1887 this committee prepared a scheme for raising an endowment of \$100,000. The plan was accepted with favor by Methodism, especially since it was inaugurated by a gift of \$10,000 in manufacturing stock from Julian S. Carr. A further boost was given during the summer when W. Duke and Sons donated \$1,000 in cash. Only later when Washington Duke decided to contribute \$85,000 to Trinity in Durham did the fund reach \$100,000 and more. Because of unforeseen drain upon the financial resources of the College, the whole sum finally shrank to less than \$40,000 in 1892; and even this was completely offset by the College debt.

Meanwhile the same committee did not neglect its responsibility to select a new president. Passing over suggestions that conformed to the traditional pattern of a popular preacher or a member of the instructional staff of the College, the Committee went afield to seek a new type of administrator. In doing this, the Committee avoided the complication of cliques who sponsored local candidates. They concentrated upon one requirement: the right man for the position, wherever or whoever he might be. In their final selection, the committee was guided largely by the advice of one person, Henry Horace Williams.

This popular young professor at Trinity had resigned to continue his graduate study at Yale College. There he became acquainted with John Franklin Crowell, a fellow student and educator from Pennsylvania. When Williams returned to North Carolina, he suggested to Carr that his friend would be an excellent choice for the presidency of Trinity. Finding Crowell's qualifications acceptable, the committee and Board of Trustees decided to offer the position to the young Pennsylvanian. After some hesitation, Crowell accepted the presidency of Trinity College in the spring of 1887.

Methodism and North Carolina generally were amazed at the selection of this young unknown from the North. Though "Methodistic" he was not a member of the Methodist Church; he was not yet thirty years old;

and he was not a Southerner. He removed the first negative by joining the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and eventually becoming a minister. Time took care of the second negative; the third was to remain a hindrance to him so long as he remained in North Carolina. Regardless of their amazement, many North Carolinians were open to conviction regarding the new president. Loyally the officials of Methodism and Trinity supported the choice of the trustees, and awaited action of the new executive at Trinity.

By his tact and especially by his energy in working for the College, Crowell soon convinced many people of his ability to manage Trinity. Under his leadership the curriculum of the College was reorganized and extended to meet current requirements in education. The library was reorganized and enlarged and new equipment purchased. With a faculty of specialists as his aim, Crowell brought from institutions of the North and Canada the first holders of the degree of doctor of philosophy. Scholarships, fellowships, and prizes were established, the development of graduate study and professional schools was planned, and academic subjects were organized into departments of specialized knowledge. New facilities for publication were provided and old ones extended. "University extension" was inaugurated. The preparatory department was abolished, but later restored.

Along with the academic reorganization went the extension of student activities through old and new organizations. Societies for the promotion of specialized knowledge sprang up. Organized athletics and new sports, including football, were introduced. A system of student self-government was developed; journalism, encouraged; and inter-collegiate contests in literary, oratorical, and athletics fostered.

Student enrollment gradually increased until it exceeded two hundred annually—the largest number since the Civil War. For the first time since the war, students came from practically every state in the South; and the first students from the North entered the College. Again women were admitted officially as students. Although the youth still came largely from the ranks of the plain people, students from families of growing wealth entered in increasing numbers. The College no longer advertised for needy young men to seek help at Trinity; but it developed a student loan fund, and self-help opportunities were provided for students.

The widening and diversification of the activities at Trinity were the result of the inspiration and energy of Crowell. He believed that the purpose of education was the training of youth for leadership in society. He encouraged the faculty and students to study the needs of their State and region and to advocate necessary changes and reforms. In his public activities and utterances he set an example of leadership. By public addresses and printed pamphlets and articles, he suggested to the General Assembly and to the citizens of the State political, social, and economic reforms. When

critics in the State advised him and his faculty to confine their activities to the lecture room and to academic circles, he asserted that freedom of speech and thought was threatened. Boldly he defended the constitutional rights of his faculty and declared that his professors could count on him for full support of their constitutional privilege.

Deeply concerned at the meager facilities for primary and secondary education in the State, Crowell lent his influence to the promotion of general education in North Carolina. When the State was slow in providing aid for schools, he worked with Methodism in North Carolina in the promotion of high schools and academies in various sections of the State.

In his activities for the College, Crowell experienced some of the same kind of difficulties that faced his predecessors. The governing boards of Trinity were sympathetic to his plans and activities, but they hesitated to involve themselves financially. Each year the North Carolina Conference pledged a sum of money to the College, but it rarely raised more than half of this sum. As in former days, students fees, donations, and profits from college supplies were the sources of income. Plans for raising the proposed endowment were continuously emphasized, and some money and many pledges were given.

The failure to meet financial obligations together with dissatisfaction with some of Crowell's administrative policies led to serious dissensions with the faculty during the College's last years in Randolph County. This dissension spread throughout Methodism when Crowell led a movement for the removal of the College from its original site to a more prominent location in the State.

Sensitive to the expanding economic forces in the United States and convinced of the potentiality of the rising industrial prosperity of the new South, Crowell was anxious to place Trinity in a position where it could serve more people and at the same time share in the profits of the new industrialism. Meager facilities and limited opportunities in Randolph County limited the work of the College. These things together with local opposition to his civic and educational policies confirmed Crowell in his conviction that the future prosperity of Trinity was dependent upon its removal to a site adjacent to a center of industrial development.

After bitter controversy in which Methodism throughout the State joined, the governing boards of the College decided to remove Trinity if a favorable proposition was presented. Such a proposition came from the city of Raleigh in 1889; and subject to certain conditions, it was accepted. Before final action could be taken on this proposal, the citizens of Durham, headed by Washington Duke and Julian S. Carr, made a better offer to Trinity. Generously the capital city freed the College from any obligation to remove to Raleigh, and the governing boards of Trinity then accepted the offer of Durham, a rapidly growing industrial town. Amid much rejoicing and

bitter criticism, Crowell prepared to remove the College from its old site in Randolph County.

Modernly equipped buildings were erected on the sixty-two acre site in Durham, and plans were made for the expansion of "Greater Trinity" into a "Duke's College" or a "University." Discouragements brought about by faulty construction of the Main Building on the new campus together with severe financial strain due to unforeseen expense and economic depression throughout the United States did not cause despair. Such hardships spurred Crowell and his Durham supporters to greater efforts. In 1892 the College, a year later than scheduled but amid much enthusiasm, opened its doors in Durham. Crowell felt that he had accomplished "the impossible" as he turned to the task of organizing the old College in its new environment. He had guided the institution into the main currents of American life; now with faith in its destiny, he urged Trinity along the highway of the future.

The little schools, Brown's Schoolhouse, Union Institute, Normal College, and Trinity College, had survived the vicissitudes of troublous times. Why did these simple schools survive in a single institution when many others flickered out along the pathway of the years? No answer to this question can be documented, but an answer may be suggested. An institution lives if it is served honestly and sincerely by leaders and friends in various generations of its history; it dies if it becomes primarily the servant of private ambitions. Through more than fifty years, the welfare of the school which was to become Trinity was the main concern of leaders, teachers, and other friends. Personal consideration was lost in a larger interest, the development of a school to serve the people of their generation. The heroic efforts of these friends were fully understood by a later president of the College. In reviewing the progress of Trinity over a twenty-five year period, William Preston Few wrote in 1917:¹

"Whoever serves Trinity College can at all times feel himself compassed about by a cloud of witnesses, both among the living and the dead. In the hard services of humanity the College has tried as by fire those who govern, those who administer, those who teach, her patrons and friends, all her servants and sons, and their friendship is correspondingly pure gold."

¹ William Preston Few, "Twenty-five Years of Trinity College," *Trinity Alumni Register*, III, 163 (July, 1917).

Samuel Lander, Educational Pioneer

BY MRS. JOHN O. WILLSON *

Anderson, South Carolina

Samuel Lander's father, whose name he bore, was an Irishman, born in Tipperary, November 12, 1792, his ancestors having emigrated from England several generations earlier. A man of unusually strong convictions, he followed successfully the trade of coach maker at Lincolnton, North Carolina, even after becoming a local Methodist preacher. His wife belonged to the Protestant colony from Alsace-Lorraine welcomed to South Ireland by Queen Anne. Although her ancestors had been Lutherans, Eliza Anne Miller Lander became a communicant of the Church of England and was confirmed in the same class with the young man who afterward became her husband, then a stranger to her. The Millers were staunch Church people, but were tolerant of, and even sympathetic with, the new sect of Methodists. Indeed they entertained John Wesley on several of his visits to Cork. Eliza Anne Miller Lander was a woman of rare gifts, refined and pious, with enough courage to break away from commonly accepted customs. She was better educated than most women of her day and was fond of reading, especially European and Church history. She continued to read fiction even after her husband became a Methodist preacher, and George Eliot's *Adam Bede* was one of her favorite books. This interesting Irish couple, whose ancestors had known and suffered religious persecution, came to this country when the Roman Catholic Church made things unhappy for them in Cork. After a few years of wandering, they settled in Lincolnton, North Carolina, in 1828 and soon began to prosper.

The South Carolina Annual Conference of the Methodist Church convened in Lincolnton, January 30, 1833, the day Samuel Lander was born. The child was frail and unpromising, and fears were felt that he might not live. The presiding Bishop of the Conference, Osgood Andrew, called at the home, laid his hand on the infant's head and prayed that he might be spared to become a preacher. The child lived, and his early life was that of a normal boy in a family with seven children.

The opportunity to learn was always an adventure to Samuel Lander; he began in his early years and kept it up to the end of his life. At four he was sent to school to a Mrs. Bevins from Charleston, South Carolina. Even before starting to school, he had been taught his letters and how to read by

* This sketch of the founder of Lander College, written with pardonable pride by Kathleen Lander Willson, his daughter, presents to the readers of the *QUARTERLY* yet more evidence of the growing educational opportunities in this area prior to the Civil War and the long hard struggle to build and rebuild educational institutions in the poverty of Reconstruction.—EDITOR.

a Miss Jacobs. During his first year at school, his uncle, the Reverend J. W. Murphy, had given him at home a taste of Greek and Latin, both of which languages he studied before English grammar. From Mrs. Bevins' school he went to the Male Academy, conducted by Murphy. A rarely gifted teacher, a native of Ireland, Murphy had been educated for the Roman Catholic priesthood, but had become an ardent Protestant—a High Church Episcopalian. He was a classical scholar and a rigid disciplinarian. Dr. Lander often said that there was only one rule in this school, and it was twelve inches long, one inch wide, and applied to the palm of the hand.

Murphy was very proud of his little nephew, who exhibited a fondness for the classics and mathematics. When, after a few years, Murphy moved to Lexington, North Carolina, young Lander followed to prepare for college. In Lexington he lived in Murphy's home and devoted himself diligently to study. He compelled himself to submit to physical discomfort. For instance, he at times slept on a hard bench to discipline himself to meet hardships if they should come. Whether this self-imposed discipline was suggested or inspired by the uncle is not clear.

When, at the age of sixteen and a half, young Lander was ready for college, his Methodist father selected Randolph-Macon. This institution was then located at Boydton, Virginia, a long way from Lincolnton in 1849, and the trip, which had to be made by carriage, took several days. Lander was examined on the Greek and Latin he had carefully read six years before when he was only ten years old, and was admitted to the Sophomore Class. His habits at college were painstaking. He made his daily walks for exercise and recreation part of his educational process by inviting a chum to join him and suggesting that they confine their conversation to some study in which they were both interested. He mentions chemistry as one such subject discussed. Ambitious to write a beautiful hand, he got a copy book and carefully wrote in it every day until he became so expert that his handwriting might almost have been taken for the work of an engraver. A note written by the President on his first report must have pleased his father. It read: "Dear Brother. This son of yours is a first rate boy and a first rate scholar of his class. You will not be ashamed of him. If you have any more of the same sort left, please send them on and oblige your friend, W. A. Smith."

An incident while at College confirmed the young student in his habit of learning everything possible about every subject. On the night before the examination in Geometry, an older student, called by the boys "Father Adams," dropped in and asked Lander if he were ready for tomorrow. He replied that he could demonstrate every proposition except "the 12th of the 8th." Adams suggested that he had better get that one. Fortunately he acted on this suggestion, for this proved to be the only proposition assigned to Lander. He went through it so well that he won the warmest praise

from his professor. From that time forth, he made it a rule to master every subject he attempted.

He was graduated as valedictorian of his class, June 10, 1852. Returning home he took up civil engineering and did some practical work on the survey of a plank road from Charlotte to Salisbury, North Carolina. To gratify his brother, the Honorable William Lander, he began the study of law. Finding after a few months that the legal profession had no charm for him, he accepted an appointment at Catawba College, Newton, North Carolina, where Hosea Hildreth Smith (father of the late Governor Hoke Smith of Georgia) needed another teacher.

Next he served as Principal of Olin Academy in Iredell County. In 1855 he was invited to return to his alma mater as Adjunct Professor of Language. This gave him opportunity to take his Master's degree, following which he returned to Olin for a year. Thence he went to Greensboro Female College (now Greensboro College), where he taught Latin and Mathematics. In 1859, at the age of twenty-six, he served as Principal of High Point Normal School, a post made vacant by the death of his brother-in-law, the Reverend William I. Langdon. From 1863 to 1867 he was Principal of the Lincolnton Female Seminary. For two years thereafter he was pastor of the Lincolnton Methodist Church.

While at Lincolnton Principal Lander rendered a notable service to his State by occupying himself with the problems of education. During the War there was a need for textbooks adapted to the circumstances of the time. As the late Dr. Stephen B. Weeks pointed out, "The State Education Association . . . determined that the whole educational influence of North Carolina could be pledged to sustain, when worthy, home publications in preference to any other, whatever might be the difference in price or mechanical execution." Accordingly, a series of school books was prepared and published during this period bearing the proud name, *Our Own*. Included in it were seven Readers, three English Grammars, and three Arithmetics published by Sterling, Campbell, and Albright of Greensboro, North Carolina. Two of *Our Own Arithmetics* were written by the Reverend S. Lander, a teacher of Lincolnton, at the request of the Department of Education.

The paper and general make-up reveal that times were hard, but there is little internal evidence that the war was going on. Several problems are suggestive. One is based on "1,000 men besieged in a town." Another states so many killed in battle, so many taken prisoners, so many sick. Another uses the date when North Carolina seceded from the Union. Another book written by the same author and brought out by the same publishers later in 1863 was *Our Own Primary Arithmetic*, a much simpler text for beginners. Both books proved useful in many schools long after the war. These books along with the others then published won commendation from

Governor Vance, who, in an address to the Legislature in 1864 said, "It is with pride that I observe the publication in our State of various new school books creditable alike to the authors and the public which has demanded them."

A more notable work by Principal Lander, appearing in 1865, was *The Verbal Primer*. This book was a private venture and embodied a method hitherto entirely unheard of in this region. In fact, in 1865 and for a long time afterward very few teachers had dreamed of the possibility of teaching a child to read without first learning the alphabet. Lander's idea was that a child could recognize a word as easily as a letter, and *The Verbal Primer* embodies that principle. Without the usual preceding alphabet, the first lesson begins: "Look, I have a nice new book." Manifestly this was the "Word Method" now generally used in the primary grades.

The books of today, however, have a different appearance from this quaint little volume in its wartime dress. The copy at hand is paper-bound, having forty-eight pages, four and a half by seven inches. The paper is the best the printer could secure at the time, but resembles our news print. The author's ingenuity was taxed to carry out his wish to make the book attractive. He insisted that it must be illustrated in order to capture the interest of the child. No cuts could be obtained in the South. By some means he secured plates from Scotland, brought into Wilmington on a little blockade runner, *The Advance*. The family tradition is that they were purchased from the firm that printed Scott's novels, which would mean James Balentyne, of Edinburgh. Impressions were made from these varied plates, and the author then wrote a short, simple story to suit each picture, using familiar words, not necessarily monosyllables. Among them are such words as beautiful, wagon, daughter, careful.

Some of the stories are sermonettes. A few contain references to the struggle going on, which naturally came into the lesson accompanying the picture of a gun. It is "papa's gun." The mother answers the child's question concerning the other parent's whereabouts: "Father went to fight for his country." Another lesson where cotton is mentioned contains the statement, "There is not as much raised now as there was before the war." Lesson forty-four might almost be regarded as propaganda. The picture is of an old Negro sawing wood. The statement closes: "Wouldn't you rather be free, Uncle Tom, so you could work for yourself? Why, no, Miss. Don't you know master gives me everything I want and takes care of me when I'm sick? What do I want to be free for?" In preparing the material for this book Lander used as critics his own two little children of ages six and eight. He would read the manuscript to the little ones, watching their faces intently. If they looked at all puzzled over a word, it was changed for one the children knew better. Many familiar names are used. Members of the family: Cousin Ella, Cousin Ida, and Aunt Milly, the faithful

cook, Blaze—the pig the children loved, and Fido—the dog belonging to the whole neighborhood. The two young critics lived to be Mrs. Mattie Lander Prince (widow of the late Judge George E. Prince now living in Anderson, South Carolina) and Dr. John M. Lander, founder of Granbery College, Juiz de Fora, Brazil, where he died twenty-one years ago.

The young author did not claim to be the originator of the word method. When a student at Randolph-Macon College, he learned that the wife of one of his professors was teaching her little child to read by this plan. It is probable that he thought he was the first in this country to publish a beginners' book without the alphabet. Indeed, he may never have known of a predecessor in New York in 1845 or of Samuel Worcester who, to quote a writer on the subject, "mildly advocated the word method in his *Primer of the English Language* in 1828."

In 1855 Lander became a member of the Masonic Lodge of Lincolnton, which ten years later proved to be a fortunate thing for him. At the close of the War the victorious Union Army had five thousand troops in the little town. Lander called on the commanding officer, General John C. Palmer, explained that he was principal of the seminary and had in his keeping a large number of girls who could not get to their homes, and asked protection for them. A guard was kept on duty constantly pacing to and fro around the building, and no serious damage was done in the village by the men in blue. A little white pony was, however, taken from its stable by one of the soldiers, giving a heartache to the principal's five year old nephew. The child asked his uncle's help, whereupon he spoke to General Palmer, and the pony was found and returned to its stable. That child, now the Reverend William L. Sherrill, of Charlotte, North Carolina, believes that his pony was restored because one Mason spoke to a brother Mason about it.

Lander's work in the pastorate at Lincolnton was eminently successful. He held a revival without outside assistance, and one hundred members were added to the church at one time. He was disposed to devote his life entirely to the ministry, but in 1868 was made President of Davenport Female College, Lenoir, North Carolina, where he served successfully for three years. In 1871 he became joint proprietor of Spartanburg Female College at Spartanburg, South Carolina. After a year there, however, he asked an appointment in the Methodist itinerancy.

The next step in Lander's career reads like a story book. He received the appointment requested and was sent to Williamston, South Carolina, where it turned out that his best work was to be done. This village church had requested as pastor an unmarried man who could teach. Other plans had been made for Lander. In fact, the Reverend J. W. Kelly, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Columbia Female College, had secured his consent to be President of that institution should it become possible to re-open

it. This depended upon the acceptance by Conference of a plan by which an insurance company would finance its debt. Near the close of the session of Conference this plan was rejected, and, there not being time to make other adjustments, Lander was sent to Williamston. He could teach, it was true, but he had a wife and seven children.

There was no parsonage, and the only vacant house in Williamston was the hotel, which was rented by the church as its contribution to the minister's salary. The preacher consulted his presiding elder and got permission to open a school. The hotel was put in shape, furniture ordered, a group of teachers quickly engaged, and advertising material distributed, announcing the opening of school for February 12, 1872. It was a gratifying surprise when on that date seventeen boarding students appeared with twenty-one from the town. The total enrollment reached sixty-one before the term closed that spring. Before the next Annual Conference, a joint-stock company was formed, plans were made for enlarging the building, and Williamston Female College was established.

There at Williamston Lander was to remain for the rest of his days, free to give attention to some of the pedagogical problems that had puzzled him. His heart was sick over the low standard of work done in most schools for girls. The motto of his state, *Esse quam videri* (To be rather than to seem), expressed the conviction of his soul, and he determined to make it the watchword of his institution. Honesty, sincerity, and thoroughness were impressed upon all as vital virtues. It requires courage to leave the beaten path, and originality is often questioned, even frowned upon. At Williamston Female College President Lander introduced several features helpful in securing thoroughness. He found, for instance, that many girls studying higher mathematics were not well grounded in arithmetic, that some were attempting to read advanced Latin who could not speak correctly their mother tongue. Consequently, he required all his pupils to review the elementary branches parallel with their higher studies, e.g., a pupil studying Trigonometry would also have regular classes in Arithmetic. This method gave the girl before graduation a "refresher course" in the subject she would probably have to teach if she went into the schoolroom.

Another innovation was the abolition of the ordinary commencement, to avoid the waste of money and time involved in preparation for the elaborate affairs then customary. The best features were kept: distinguished men preached final sermons and made addresses, but the parade of the girls was omitted. In an effort to encourage thoroughness and help poor girls President Lander established a system of tuitional premiums. He opposed giving medals and rewards obtainable by only a single successful competitor. His plan was open to all students, and the larger the number who won, the greater his delight, though it reduced his income. For an excellent average, a pupil was rewarded by having her tuition for the next term reduced up

to 50 per cent, with special premiums added for excellence in spelling and composition. The report of a pupil in 1886, for example, shows an average of 97 $\frac{1}{10}$, entitling her to a general premium of 50 per cent; spelling, 98, entitled her to an additional 10 per cent; composition, 95, entitled her to a further 10 per cent, making a total premium of 70 per cent. Many girls in this way never paid the regular amount of tuition after their first term at college. This was a financial help to the students, and helped to secure for the College the more studious and desirable girls.

President Lander became interested in Froebel's educational ideas and resolved to establish a kindergarten. This school for little children was opened in 1876 in the early years at Williamston; a normal class was conducted also to train teachers in this method. This was the first kindergarten in South Carolina outside of Charleston, from which city President Lander secured a teacher, trained in New York.

Thirteen years after the publication of his *Verbal Primer* President Lander embarked upon an even more remarkable departure from the current academic practice by organizing his school according to the One Study Plan, perhaps better called the Concentrated Study Plan. The session was divided into seven sections of five weeks each, and one subject of study was emphasized during each section. No one in the region had previously heard of such a plan, though it later transpired that a school in Scio, Ohio, had made a similar experiment for a short time. Before introducing this method, President Lander discussed it with many teacher friends and others, who uniformly advised strongly against taking such a radical step and prophesied failure and financial ruin. In September, 1877, however, the plan was adopted at Williamston Female College, and continued to be used with conspicuous success and satisfaction for a number of years after the removal of the College to Greenwood, South Carolina, in 1904.

President Lander's claims for the superiority of his method may be conveniently seen from his statement in the college catalogue:

1. Attention in studying; 2. Attention in recitation; 3. Retention of instruction; 4. Enthusiasm and success; 5. Habit of concentration; 6. Symmetry of development; 7. Convenience of classification; 8. It secures thoroughness; 9. Graduation at any time; 10. Pupils like it.

In a word, though we frankly confess that there are a few real objections to our plan, in spite of its superior advantages, and that we have not yet discovered the royal road of learning, we are perfectly satisfied that we have a plan more consistent with common sense and more promising of good results than the one in general use.

During his many years in the classroom, President Lander gained a deeper insight into mathematics, natural science, and other branches. He gratified his love of language by studying, without a teacher, German, French, Span-

ish, and Italian until he could read these languages, though he never attempted to speak them. In 1878 Trinity College, North Carolina, conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Divinity. His modest soul seemed oppressed by this honor, and he remarked that he certainly was unworthy of the title, since he did not even know the Hebrew alphabet. He set at once about studying that language, and it was not long before he could read the Old Testament in the original text. He then made it a rule to read a few verses in his Hebrew Bible every day. When, in 1889, his eldest son went as a missionary to Brazil, Dr. Lander began the study of Portuguese in order to read the Brazilian papers to which he subscribed and thus to keep up with affairs in that land. Just three years before his death he took up the study of Erse. These languages were learned in the little fragments of time which came to him in his busy college life. Few men have been so unceasingly busy, and few have known better how to improve their leisure.

Dr. Lander at Williamston was largely busy with his pastorate and the College, but he found much else to do beside. When he arrived in 1872, the little village had three bar-rooms. He had belonged to a temperance organization in North Carolina. A few of the best men in Williamston followed his leadership, and together they succeeded in closing those saloons and in having the Legislature pass a law making a safety zone prohibiting bar-rooms within a radius of three miles of the College.

In the South Carolina Conference of his Church, Dr. Lander's work was unstinted and multiform. He served on many committees and for a great many years was statistical secretary of the Conference, his painstaking accuracy being rewarded year after year by reelection. He was a delegate to the General Conference of 1890 and again in 1894. Another service to his Conference was in the benevolent organization known as the Brotherhood. From its beginning in 1885 till his death in 1904 he was the Secretary-Treasurer. That year the Brotherhood was merged with the Methodist Benevolent Association of Nashville, Tennessee.

Besides his labors in his own institution, Dr. Lander gave time and interest to the cause of education in his county and in the state at large. For many years he was a member of the Board of Examiners to give certificates to teachers of the public schools. Often he participated in the newly organized teachers' institutes—the abbreviated forerunner of the present summer schools. In 1897 he served as President of the South Carolina Education Association.

He lived before the days of private secretaries and presidents' assistants, his only helper being his eldest daughter. After her marriage in 1878 he conducted all his correspondence, did all the bookkeeping, made out all the reports, and usually taught two or three classes. His excessive writing showed on his beautiful penmanship. Indeed, when symptoms of penman's paralysis appeared in the eighties, he got a typewriter—a Calligraph—one

of the first machines purchased in South Carolina. One wonders at the amount of work he accomplished. All this could not have been done but for his methodical habits and the poise of his well-trained mind. Serenely, he went on, steadily employed but never nervously rushing. His work was a joy and never a burden.

December 20, 1853, Dr. Lander had been married to Laura Ann McPherson, whom he had known from childhood. Eleven children were born to them, one of them dying in infancy. Of this marriage one in a position to know wrote:

"For more than fifty years the currents of their lives were blended and at their golden wedding day their romance was as real as it was in '53. The resilience of her nature, the sunshine of her soul, the buoyancy and kindness and goodness—yes, and faith—these were what she brought into his life and who could live in such a presence and fail of greatness."

After the college had been thirty-two years at Williamston, the city of Greenwood, South Carolina, offered a site and suitable building if it would remove to that town. Enlargement at Williamston was impossible; so the offer of Greenwood was accepted gratefully, thought with no little reluctance at the prospect of leaving its first home. Dr. Lander felt that the move to Greenwood would put on a permanent foundation the College to which he had given the best of his life. He made all arrangements for the transfer, selected the faculty, and named the date of opening for September 27, 1904. He was destined never to see the completed building in Greenwood, now called Lander College in his honor. He died on July 14, two months before the opening.

Lander College has developed the custom of observing Dr. Lander's birthday as Founder's Day. On this occasion, distinguished men, some of them friends of the founder, have made addresses on educational subjects or reminiscential speeches concerning him and his College. Among them, Dr. William P. Few, President of Duke University said: "So far as I know, the old Williamston Female College was a pioneer among Southern colleges for women in the handling of solid intellectual wares. The battle for plain, straightforward honesty in education has not been completely won, and the man who started the fight in a part of the field where it was most urgently needed ought to be remembered with gratitude." Dr. T. N. Ivey said: "No history of American education, no catalogue of high American exploits, no record of American success built on the self-sacrifice of God-filled hearts can be complete without the name of Samuel Lander, the evangel of Christ and a Christian educator." Bishop John C. Kilgo, a personal friend, said of him: "It is not going too far to say that Dr. Lander knew how to make education a saving force, that he knew how to reach and bring out those

nergies of mind and spirit which make for real progress, that he rightly distinguished between the frivolous and vital qualities of mind and character. By fidelity to his belief he has sent out into this commonwealth a young womanhood whose distinct traits are seriousness, sincerity, and womanly integrity. He has founded an institution that has a clear and definite mission to young women." Finally, the Reverend William L. Sherrill, in family history, wrote of Dr. Lander: "He was all of a gentleman, all of a scholar, and all of a Christian—chivalrous, cultured, consecrated. There were blended in him in just proportion those elements which go to make a nobleman. North Carolina has furnished to the church and state a large number of men who have distinguished themselves in peace and war, but I am sure that only a few of her sons, when final results are measured, have rendered to mankind a service so far-reaching and uplifting as did this humble and unpretentious but truly great man, who, to the end of his days, was busy in season and out of season, striving to prepare the young women of the land for larger life and nobler service."

A Brief History of the Kentucky Association of Colleges and Universities

By JAMES H. HEWLETT

Dean, Centre College of Kentucky

On April 8, 1905, at the call of Dr. Arthur Yager, of the faculty of Georgetown College, representatives from various Kentucky Colleges met in Science Hall, at State College, for the purpose of organizing these institutions into an association. A temporary organization was effected by electing Dr. Yager president and Professor C. D. Lewis, of Berea College, secretary. On motion, the chairman appointed the following committee on permanent organization: President F. W. Hinitt, Central University of Kentucky (now Centre College); President John Weber, Kentucky Wesleyan College; Professor Kastle, State College (now the University of Kentucky); Professor Ryland, Georgetown College; and Professor Dewees, Kentucky University (now Transylvania College). The minutes of this first meeting then state, interestingly enough, that arrangements were next made for a banquet at the Phoenix Hotel. "The banquet with toasts became a part of the proceedings until 1915 when, because of train schedules and difficulties of representatives reaching home on Saturday night, it was changed to a noonday lunch. Then it was decided to drop the feature altogether."¹

A program had been arranged for the day. President Hinitt spoke on "A Method of Controlling Secondary Education," a subject that doubtless reveals a very definite attitude on the part of those present to hear it discussed. But in the afternoon, President C. W. Dabney, of the University of Cincinnati, spoke on "The Duty of the College to the Public Schools," which may have eased the situation somewhat for the public schools. Another address was given by President J. J. Taylor, of Georgetown College, on "Religious Education." It is regrettable that these papers were not printed, or at least summarized in the minutes, since it would be very interesting to know some of the views held by these men on such subjects at that time.

The report of the committee on organization gave the purposes of the new association as follows; "1. To constitute a bond of union between its members in the work of advancing the interests of higher education in Kentucky; 2. To concert and forward measures for the general advancement of the educational interests of the Commonwealth; 3. To promote the effici-

¹ Quoted from an article Dean F. L. Rainey (Centre College; deceased) wrote on the Association, which was printed in its *Proceedings*, 1930, pp. 38ff. I shall refer frequently to this article as one of my most authoritative sources, for Dean Rainey was secretary of the organization for many years and knew its history as few men did.

acy and welfare of the secondary schools of the State by the establishment of uniform and advanced entrance requirements to college and by uniting these schools in their activities as they are preparing students for college work." (Minutes.)

There were to be a president, a vice-president, a secretary-treasurer, and an executive committee of five members, two of whom would be the president and the secretary. The association voted to meet annually in April. The membership was to consist of six institutions: The State College of Kentucky, Kentucky Wesleyan College, Berea College, Kentucky University, Georgetown College, and Central University of Kentucky. Apparently these members felt that their own standards were quite satisfactory, but they directed the executive committee to report at the next meeting on requirements for membership. The first president was James K. Patterson, State College, and the first secretary was Arthur Yager, Georgetown. And thus the Association of Kentucky Colleges and Universities got under way.

At the next annual meeting two steps were taken that were significant for the Association and reveal the standards of education the higher institutions of learning were meeting at that time in Kentucky—qualifications for membership were adopted and also entrance requirements for admission to the freshman class of member institutions. Membership qualifications were as follows: "Any degree-granting institution may be eligible to membership in the Association which offers at least a four-year course for its baccalaureate degree; which requires for entrance a secondary school course of not less than two years after the completion of the common school course prescribed by the State Board of Education; and which employs in its faculty not less than five men who do collegiate work exclusively." (Minutes.)

Dean Rainey writes:

"A few years after I came to Danville to live, I met a graduate of Centre—Old Centre as he insisted, not the Centre College of the Central University of Kentucky—who told me that when he presented himself for registration, being a graduate of a nearby high school, the committee on entrance asked him just which class he wanted to enter. He chose the junior, was so enrolled, and graduated with a perfectly good A. B. in two years. I thought at the time he was spoofing me; but looking over those curious old records, at once objects of interest and anathema in my office, I believe he was telling me the truth. One of the traditional stories of my earlier days in Kentucky was of the high schools, and some schools that were hardly reputable high schools, chartered to grant the A.B. degree. Probably it was an advanced step to require at least two years of training above the common schools as prerequisite for college."

At this same meeting the Association heard a paper on "Uniform Requirements for Admission to Kentucky Colleges" and appointed a committee to bring the entrance requirements of all the Kentucky Colleges to some uniform standard, which should be as nearly as practicable the same as those of the Southern Association. It also agreed to work toward establishing a list of accredited high schools.

At the meeting in 1908 the committee on uniform entrance requirements recommended that each member college require 14 units for admission, a unit representing five hours of work for an academic year. Of these, $3\frac{1}{2}$ might be elective. The others were prescribed as follows: English, 3; Latin, 3; mathematics, $2\frac{1}{2}$; history, 1; science, 1. A student could be conditioned in 3 units, which had to be worked off by the end of the sophomore year. The recommendation was adopted. Though there was no reference to Carnegie units in the minutes, undoubtedly such units were in the mind of the members of the Association. At the fifth annual meeting, on December 4, 1909 (there were two meetings in 1909), the committee on entrance requirements reported that the uniform requirements formerly adopted were being enforced by all the institutions of the Association and that they had been a help to both the colleges and the high schools.

At the sixth annual meeting, December 3, 1910, the committee on accredited schools and entrance requirements made a very encouraging report that showed much work had been done. It had found 103 schools worthy of being accredited—63 public and 40 private. Of the public high schools 42 were ranked A and 21 B; of the private, 26 were ranked A and 14 B. The committee was proud to declare that its work was attracting favorable comment outside the State and that within the State there was abundant evidence of good fruit resulting from its labors. "We have seen 30-minute recitations give way to 45, two teachers to three, and where previously there was none or only very poor laboratory equipment we have witnessed the introduction of good equipment." (Minutes.)

It is very evident that the Association during its first five years was making real progress in raising the standards of both colleges and high schools in Kentucky.

Another important advancement in standards was made at the session in 1914. At a previous meeting of the executive committee of the Association, the secretary (Rainey, elected in 1911) had emphasized the need of "a more definite statement of college standards in its requirements for members, and a special meeting was devoted to this question."² As a result, Article I, Section 2 was amended to read:

"Members of the faculty of any other college or university in Kentucky which employs at least six full-time professors giving their entire

² Rainey, F. L., in *Proceedings*, 1930, p. 42.

professional time to college or university work and which requires for the baccalaureate degree the completion of at least one hundred and twenty semester hours, exclusive of physical training, and which requires for admission to its freshman class not less than fifteen units approved by the committee on accredited schools, and has from tuition and other regular funds an annual income of not less than fifteen thousand dollars, and has accessible to its students a library adequate to the needs of its various departments systematically catalogued, and has enough scientific equipment to provide for at least two full years of laboratory instruction in each of the fundamental sciences, i. e., chemistry, biology and physics, shall be eligible for membership in this association and shall be recognized as members upon the acceptance of the institution to which they belong by the executive committee of this association."

The minutes of a meeting of the executive committee held on November 24, 1924, state that the committee would meet again in December "to prepare a revision of the standards of the Association to be submitted to the meeting in January." I have not been able to find the minutes of the annual meeting of 1925. Dean Rainey, however, was secretary, and he says that "in 1925 a new statement of standards was submitted by the executive committee and, being approved by each member institution, became the official standards of the Association."³ These new standards were as follows and show the real progress the Association of Kentucky Colleges and Universities had made since its organization twenty years before:

"1. There shall be at least eight departments in the liberal arts and sciences, each having at least one full-time teacher of professional rank.

"2. There shall be required for the baccalaureate degree the completion of at least one hundred and twenty hours (semester) exclusive of physical training.

"3. There shall be required for admission to the freshman class not less than fifteen units approved by the accredited schools committee of this association.

"4. There shall be in addition to income derived from tuition the income from a productive endowment of not less than five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000), or if tax supported an annual income of not less than fifty thousand dollars. In interpreting the annual income, twelve thousand dollars may be included if derived from stable sources other than a fixed endowment.

"5. There should be a live, well-distributed, professionally administered library of at least 8,000 volumes, exclusive of public documents, bearing specifically upon the subjects taught and with a definite annual

³ Rainey, *loc. cit.*

appropriation for the purchase of new books in keeping with the curriculum.

"6. There shall be enough scientific equipment to provide for at least two full years of laboratory instruction in each of the fundamental sciences (biology, chemistry, physics), which facilities are maintained by adequate annual appropriations.

"7. A properly qualified college teacher should have at least two years of graduate training and the head of each department should hold a doctor's degree, or have an equivalent training and experience. In all cases, the teacher's success is to be determined: first, by the efficiency of his teaching, and second, by his research work.

"8. The average salary paid to members of the faculty is an important consideration in determining the standing of the institution. It is, therefore, recommended that the salaries of full professors should be not less than three thousand dollars per year.

"9. The conferring of a multiplicity of degrees should be discouraged. Small institutions should confine their degrees to one or two. When more than one baccalaureate degree is conferred, the requirements should represent an equivalent of preparation.

"10. Sixteen hours of teaching per week should be the maximum for teachers. Two hours of laboratory work should be counted as one of recitation." ⁴

At the meeting of the Association held in January, 1930, a committee was appointed to consider the publication of the papers presented at the annual meetings. This committee recommended to the executive committee at its meeting in April, 1930, that the papers be published as a part of the Bulletin of the University of Kentucky and that the Association bear a part of the expense. The recommendation was accepted both by the committee and the University of Kentucky and since 1930 this arrangement has been in force. Perhaps the spirit of the organization at that time can be illustrated by quoting a paper read by Dr. H. L. Donovan, the president (now president of the University of Kentucky):

"Some truths are axiomatic. They need no demonstration. Even the mathematician who is always demanding proof accepts some propositions as self-evident. In striking off the seal of our great commonwealth, our fathers hit upon such a truth. The colleges of Kentucky do not fall without the limits of this great fundamental principle of life: 'United we stand; divided we fall.';

"If there be any animosities, jealousies or petty prejudices between or among these institution, your president is not aware of them. This

⁴ Rainey, *ibid*, 43.

is the twenty-fifth annual meeting of the Association of Kentucky Colleges and Universities. It is an auspicious occasion that brings us together in peace and harmony to discuss our common problems. We meet here with mutual respect and admiration for each other. May we ever realize that there should be no competition between the colleges of our state, but that we are rivals only in service. Let us recognize that the problems of higher education are of such magnitude that it will take the coöperative effort of all the colleges to solve them adequately. There are more young men and women in Kentucky who are in need of college education than can be provided for in all the colleges. Ours is a problem of whole-hearted coöperation in the interest of advancing the intellectual level of our commonwealth. It is my prayer that we may ever dwell together as a league of colleges promoting good fellowship and advancing in unbroken front our march against ignorance, prejudices and superstition.”⁵

Though I can find no specific motion, it seems that Junior Colleges were first admitted to membership in the Association in 1933 and were given representation on the executive committee. At this time, too, the member institutions were asked to consider the expansion of the organization into the Kentucky Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Also the following regulation on entrance examinations was adopted:

“Students not graduates of an accredited school may be admitted only by examination.

“1. If such a student presents for entrance 15 or more acceptable units from an accredited school, he must, to gain admittance, pass examinations in at least all of the subjects that the college specifies as required for entrance.

“2. If a student presents 15 or more acceptable units from a non-accredited school, or is a graduate with such units of a non-accredited school, he must pass entrance examinations on 15 acceptable units.

“3. If the college desires to use the psychological and achievement tests such as those used in the coöperative testing program of this Association, it is permitted to do so.” (Minutes.)

One other progressive step was taken at the meeting. Upon motion of President C. J. Turck, of Centre College, these three resolutions were adopted:

1. That the office of County Superintendent be made appointive by the County Board of Education and not elective.

2. That the system of sub-district school trustees be abolished and

⁵ *Proceedings*, 1930, p. 7.

that the County Board of Education elect all teachers and principals for such schools on the recommendation of the County Superintendent.

"3. That it shall be a crime for any person to give or receive money or any other consideration for making or receiving an appointment to teach in the public or private educational institutions of the state." (Minutes.)

At the meeting in 1934, on motion of President H. L. Donovan, the following recommendations enlarging the scope of the Association to include the secondary schools were approved and adopted:

"For the purpose of a closer professional affiliation and for the mutual benefit of both the high schools and the colleges of the State, we recommend that the secondary schools be invited to unite with the colleges under the following conditions:

"1. That each division maintain its identity.

"2. That the business of each organization be conducted separately.

"3. That when business arises of mutual interest to each division, it must be approved by each organization before it becomes binding on both the secondary schools and the colleges." (Minutes.)

The last meeting of the old Kentucky Association of Colleges and Universities was held on January 10-11, 1935. It had done a great work for both higher and secondary education in Kentucky. It had served as a bond of union between its members in the work of advancing the interest of higher education in Kentucky; it had passed and supported measures for the general advancement of the educational interests of the Commonwealth; it had promoted the efficiency and welfare of the secondary schools of the State by establishing uniform and advanced entrance requirements to college and by uniting these schools in their activities of preparing students for college. In other words, the organization had lived up to the high purposes for which it was founded. Let me mark the close of this significant period of the Association by quoting again from Dean Rainey, who was its secretary from 1911 to 1931:⁶

"After all, the great thing has been the associations, the acquaintances, the friendships we have formed here with one another. May I give a personal reaction. The Association was but three years old when I came into the college life of Kentucky, and there was a very definite feeling of distrust, of suspicion, of lack of coöperation in the educational atmosphere. Destructive criticism I heard on all sides. The college men did not know each other. Miller [a member of the faculty of the University of Kentucky] and I knew of each other through

⁶Rainey, F. L., in *Proceedings*, 1930, p. 51.

a newspaper controversy, and we mutually had a poor estimate of each other. One day in the year, perhaps two, we have come together face to face as those with a common cause. And distrust has largely, I hope completely, broken down. We are really good friends all after we have talked together, have eaten together, have counselled together. Even though no other objective had been achieved, I feel that this one thing has been well worthwhile. . . .

"Yes, I think that our founders' bond of union has been achieved."

The first meeting of the new association—the Kentucky Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools—was held on January 10-11, 1936. Its internal organizations is as follows:

"1. An executive committee composed of ten members selected from the colleges and secondary schools of the state.

"2. A commission on colleges and universities consisting of sixteen members, ten of which are selected from the junior and senior colleges and six from the secondary schools.

"3. A commission on secondary schools composed of ten members chosen from the secondary schools, six from the colleges, two from the State Department of Education, and one from the Department of Education of the University of Kentucky."

functioning under the two commissions and the executive committee are various committees. At present under the Commission on Higher Education are committees on high school deficiencies in English, arithmetic, and spelling; on research in higher education; on college standards; on the improvement of college teaching; on teacher education; and on postwar education. Under the Commission on Secondary Education are committees on research in secondary education, on membership, on library work, on evaluation, on extra-curricular activities, and on postwar secondary education. General committees functioning under the executive committee are on guidance, on articulation of college and high school, on publications, and on planning.

The influence and accomplishments of this new Association are far greater than those of the old one, which was limited merely to the colleges and universities. Space forbids my listing all of its many activities. A recent summary put out by the Secretary-Treasurer of the Association is in part as follows:

"1. It is a working organization seeking to attack through its two commissions and seventeen committees problems that are vital to progress in higher and secondary education in Kentucky.

"2. It acts as an accrediting body for colleges and is so recognized in Kentucky law.

"3. Its commission on secondary schools assists the State Department in recommending schools for accrediting to the State Board of Education and in setting up standards for accrediting.

"4. It has three representatives who meet with the State Council on Public Higher Education when matters of teacher training are considered.

"5. It holds an annual meeting and distributes the 'Proceedings' to its members.

"6. It issues a monthly news letter which is sent to all members.

"7. It has elected all county superintendents as honorary members and endeavors to assist them in the solution of their problems.

"8. It has published and distributed to the secondary schools of Kentucky a handbook on guidance.

"9. It conducts and supports the coöperative testing service in the State.

"10. It collects annually and sells at cost to its college members the list of seniors in Kentucky secondary schools and junior colleges.

"11. It has prepared and sells at cost a uniform college admission blank.

"12. It collects annually and publishes the enrollments in the Kentucky colleges.

"13. It uses its influence in support of legislation helpful to education both in the Kentucky Assembly and in the Congress."

Its membership consists of 17 four-year colleges, 13 junior colleges, and 279 secondary schools. (*Bulletin*, 1943.)

Before closing this article, I feel obligated to name those men who have given so much time and labor to organize and promote the work of the old Kentucky Association of Colleges and Universities as well as that of the later Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. But where should I begin and where should I stop? Many men have played a noble part. Let me simply pay tribute to two secretary-treasurers of the two organizations. One of these was my dear friend and colleague, Dean F. L. Rainey, who, as I have already said, for twenty years served in this office and resigned because of poor health. We have missed him sorely at Centre College and in this Association since his death in 1936. How well he knew the work of the old Association and how faithfully and long he labored for it! The other is Dean Paul P. Boyd of the University of Kentucky, who succeeded Dean Rainey and is still in office. His quiet, unassuming ways, his friendly smile and fine spirit, and his efficient and persistent efforts in behalf of an outstanding educational program in Kentucky have endeared him to all of us in the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. There were others like them—good men, strong and true.

Perhaps it would be of interest to give here the names of the officers of the Association for 1944-45: president, Principal H. B. Gray, Bowling Green High School, Bowling Green, Kentucky; vice-president, Acting President A. Brown, Transylvania College, Lexington, Kentucky; secretary-treasurer, Dean Paul P. Boyd, The University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky. The president and secretary of the Commission on Colleges and Universities are Acting President L. A. Brown of Transylvania College and Dr. James H. Hewlett, Centre College, Danville, Kentucky, and the president and secretary of the Commission on Secondary Schools are President Warren F. Jones, Campbellsville College, Campbellsville, Kentucky, and Principal J. M. Deacon, Morton Junior High School, Lexington, Kentucky.

The Association of Georgia Colleges

BY W. D. HOOPER

Professor of Latin, University of Georgia

The Association of Georgia Colleges is perhaps unique in that it did not originate with the colleges themselves, but largely with representatives of the high schools.

Only older members of the Southern Association can realize the condition of chaos which obtained within the territory of the Association when it was formed; and this condition was notable in the state of Georgia. Almost every college had its preparatory department or sub-freshman class—partly because secondary schools were few in number, and most of them had only two or three grades.

In 1904 the General Education Board attempted to alleviate the conditions in the secondary field and furnished means for the employment of a "High School Inspector" in the several Southern states. In Georgia, Chancellor Walter B. Hill, of the University of Georgia, was fortunate in his selection of the man to hold this position: Dr. Joseph S. Stewart, who had been President of the North Georgia Agricultural College, accepted the appointment, and spent the rest of his life in developing the secondary school system in the State—with such success that he attained to a national reputation. It is no exaggeration to call him the father of secondary education in Georgia. The increase in the number of high schools was so great that the United States Bureau of Education actually questioned the accuracy of his report for one year. Along with this increase in number went also a steadily rising standard; and now perhaps a majority of the high schools in the State are regular members of the Southern Association. But his most conspicuous success was in obtaining, after years of effort, an amendment to the Constitution of the State which permitted the General Assembly to appropriate money to the secondary schools. Prior to that time the rather narrow provision of the Constitution limited such appropriation to schools for "providing the elements of an English education." The present happy condition of the schools is largely due to this amendment.

As soon as Dr. Stewart secured a considerable number of superintendents and principals, he began to hold conferences during the summer school at the University for the discussion of the problems which were constantly arising in the formation and coördination of this new element in the educational world of the State. At such a meeting in the summer of 1914 a call was issued for a meeting in December of that year in Atlanta. This meeting, attended by 27 persons, of whom 15 were representatives of 12 colleges, spent a day discussing problems which had arisen during the period of ten

years, and suggested the formation of an Association. The minute, which has some historical interest, is as follows:

"At the request of the Chairman, Mr. Stewart stated that the conference had been called at the request of the High School Conference at its July meeting, for the purpose of discussing matters of administration of admission to college. A Committee of this Conference had been appointed to present the views of this Conference, and the members of this Committee presented the problems that have arisen in the course of the development of the system. After general and prolonged discussion, which was interrupted by luncheon and resumed afterwards, it was on motion resolved that the following Articles of Agreement be referred to the several colleges of the state for discussion, amendment, or ratification by them."

These Articles of Agreement were distributed among the several colleges in the state, and at a meeting held in Atlanta on December 28, 1915, at which were present representatives of 9 colleges, a Constitution was adopted, embracing the Articles of Agreement, which has remained essentially unchanged. The pertinent articles are as follows:

I

"The name of this Association shall be The Association of Georgia Colleges.

II

"Institutions conferring a Bachelor's degree on the completion of four years of college work, and subscribing to the following agreement, are eligible to membership.

Preamble

"The colleges of Georgia whose Presidents, with the approval of the several faculties, have signed these articles of agreement, desiring a uniform classification of Georgia high schools and more stable adjustment of college admission requirements, hereby agree to observe the following articles of agreement:

Article I

"In view of the fact that the University of Georgia has developed a comprehensive system of school visitation for the promotion of higher standards in schools and colleges, and since this has been done at public expense and with the aid of the General Education Board and all the colleges are entitled to make use of the University classification if they desire, it is agreed:

"That the colleges signing these articles will admit into college on

certificate only such students from Georgia schools as have attended schools classified and accredited by the University, as provided in Article V of this agreement; provided, first, that students over twenty years of age may be admitted as individuals as special or unclassified, at the discretion of the several colleges, and such students may become regular only by absolving all entrance requirements; and provided, second, that any denominational college may deal with students coming from preparatory schools supported and controlled by its own denomination as it may see fit, but it shall not admit students on certificate from preparatory schools controlled by any other denomination unless such schools have been placed on the accredited list herein adopted."

The remaining articles are concerned with the basis of accrediting schools, annual reports on their graduates, uniform blanks, and the like. They provided also for the usual officers, a time of the annual meeting, and the amendment of the Constitution.

In addition to the reasons here assigned for the formation of an Association, many college men felt the need for an Association where members of the several faculties might meet in a spirit of fellowship. Strange as it seems to us now, there was intense rivalry between many of the colleges, which frequently led to bitterness of word and act. As many of them were dependent for their lives on student attendance, they were not only lax in the enforcement of entrance requirements, but rivals for the comparatively few graduates of the high schools. Not only in Georgia but elsewhere in the South, some of the denominational colleges were especially bitter toward the State institutions; sermons were frequently preached, aimed not more at attracting students to the denominational college than at attacking the "godless State" institutions. In this happier day the expression is sometimes used, but always with a smile. In the correction of this attitude at least, the Association has been eminently successful. Some of the members set themselves deliberately to this task, with such success that one day a venerable faculty member called me aside and said to me, with a pained expression: "There is one feature which to me is very distressing. I notice that Dean Smith, of Wesleyan, never neglects an opportunity to make a cutting remark to you, and I wish you would remonstrate with him." To which I could only reply, with a smile: "My dear Doctor, don't you notice that I always come back at him with a similar remark? We are doing this deliberately, and he is so warm a friend of mine that we know our remarks will be taken in good part." The result is that now all the representatives at the annual meetings are on the most friendly footing, and the old bitterness and misunderstanding has almost entirely disappeared. This is perhaps the most conspicuous service the Association has rendered.

As appears from the "Articles of Agreement," the chief concern of the Association in its early years was the clarification of the relations between the colleges and the secondary schools; as indeed this was the chief concern of the Southern Association. Younger members of the latter Association will perhaps be surprised to know why its name was changed from the cumbersome "Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States." The change was made not merely to avoid a long and awkward title, but to emphasize that its members included those which were not chiefly preparatory for college, since it originally contained only colleges of liberal arts and the schools which prepared for them.

As the influence of the Southern Association grew, and more and more schools and colleges aspired to be members, this feature of the work of the Georgia Association became less important; and finally, under the auspices of the Association there was formed the Georgia High School Accrediting Commission, with Dr. Stewart as its Chairman. This was the most democratic of such institutions, being composed of members from the College Association, from the High School Association, and from the State Department of Education. Since the formation of this Commission, the Association has had little discussion of the problem which was really the cause of its organization. Dr. Stewart, who suggested and was for years Chairman of a similar Commission of the Southern Association, was Chairman of the State Commission until his death, and its policies were largely of his formulation. Its chief concern has been the raising of the standards in the high schools, and it has held out constantly the goal of membership in the Southern Association. A glance at the list of members in Georgia will show how successful its efforts have been. A regular feature of the Association has been a formal report of the graduates of high schools entering college, the amount and quality of their preparation, and their records in college. This report, in printed form, is distributed to the whole list of high schools and has formed an important item in their accredited status.

At first the Georgia Association included both senior and junior colleges, but the latter increased in number to the point where they desired an Association of their own. In recent years, under the provision that only junior colleges which were on the approved list of the Southern Association could be members of the College Association, so many of them have attained this position that the Junior College Association could hardly exist without a double membership. The College Association now includes 12 junior colleges as members, and the two Associations hold a joint session at the annual meetings.

As the Georgia Association and the High School Accrediting Commission have always worked in close harmony with the Southern Association and its Commissions—to which it has contributed prominent members—and as its function as a standardizing agency have become less important, its meet-

ings have been devoted largely to the discussion of questions of either permanent or temporary interest. These meetings, which have been held every year except 1943, when the meeting was adjourned in deference to wartime restrictions, include a banquet on the evening preceding the regular meeting, at which some speaker is featured, with a program of papers the following day. The meetings have been held in Atlanta or Macon, as being central points in the state. The present senior-college members of the Association are Agnes Scott College, Bessie Tift College, Brenau College, Emory University, Georgia School of Technology, Georgia State College for Women, Georgia State Womans College, Georgia Teachers College, LaGrange College, Martha Berry College, Mercer University, Piedmont College, Shorter College, University of Georgia, and Wesleyan College. The twelve junior-college members are Andrew College, Armstrong Junior College, Augusta Junior College, Emory Junior College, Georgia Military College, Georgia Southwestern College, Gordon Military College, Middle Georgia College, North Georgia College, South Georgia College, West Georgia College, and Young Harris College.

As Chairman of the High School Conference in 1914, Leon P. Smith presided over the preliminary meeting of that year, and also over the organization meeting of 1915; and, pursuant to a motion adopted at that meeting, he also presided over the permanent organization meeting of 1916, and was regularly elected President for 1917. The esteem in which he was held by his colleagues is expressed in the resolution which was adopted at the meeting in 1938, soon after his death:

"Dean Leon P. Smith, of Wesleyan College, was never absent from a meeting of the Association and was President for a term in our early history. He was indefatigable in service to the Association as committee member; and he participated frequently in the debates and discussions, always with sober good sense, frequently with keen wit, and always with courtesy.

"After all, his personality has been of as great value to us as his undoubted ability as teacher and executive. A man of wide culture, of genial spirit, with a genius for friendship, he won easily the warm affection of the members of the Association. It is a cheering thought that at our last annual meeting he had the gratification of hearing his distinguished son [Dean Smith, of the University of Chicago] address the Association as its guest speaker. The members of the Association feel keenly the loss of a dear friend and colleague."

The Presidents who have succeeded Dean Smith are as follows: 1918, T. P. Branch; 1919, Edgar H. Johnson; 1920, Miss Daisy Davies; 1921, H. J. Pearce; 1922, Theo. H. Jack; 1923, Rufus W. Weaver; 1924, J. F. Sellers; 1925, J. R. McCain; 1926, W. F. Quillian; 1927, H. H. Caldwell;

1928, R. H. Powell; 1929, W. D. Furry; 1930, Geo. P. Butler; 1931, Jon. C. Rogers; 1932, E. H. Scott; 1933, Goodrich C. White; 1934, L. L. Hendren; 1935, Jno. B. Clark; 1936, Dice R. Anderson; 1937, J. L. Skinner; 1938, Paul M. Cousins; 1939, Harmon W. Caldwell; 1940, J. R. McCain; 1941, J. L. Daniel; 1942-43, Frank R. Reade; and 1944, Hubert Quillian.

W. D. Hooper, who acted as Secretary of the original Conference in 1914, was elected Secretary at the organization meeting and has remained continuously in that position. He is now Secretary-Treasurer.

Although frequent mention has been made in this sketch of Dr. Joseph S. Stewart, it is not inappropriate to close it with an excerpt from the resolution adopted at the meeting in 1935 after his death:

"He was for some years President of the North Georgia Agricultural College, but is better known not only to all Georgians but in the councils of the Southern Association and beyond for his discerning leadership and wise counsels in connection with the work of the Commission on Secondary Schools and as editor of the High School Quarterly. His work at the University of Georgia as Professor of Secondary Education and in the correlation of the secondary school system of Georgia is known to all of us. His annual reports to the Association of Georgia Colleges as well as his timely suggestions have featured our meetings since the session of 1915.

A man of unimpeachable integrity and innate purity of life, with quiet humor and a cheering smile, we all counted him our friend. We shall miss his presence, but his influence will abide. He has 'erected a monument more lasting than bronze.' "

The Association of Alabama Colleges

BY T. H. NAPIER

Dean, Alabama College

The Association of Alabama Colleges was organized on April 13, 1908, at a meeting in Montgomery called for the purpose by the presidents of the degree-granting institutions of the state. The inspiration for the meeting came primarily from Doctor John W. Abercrombie, president of the University. The aims of the organization, as stated in the constitution adopted at a call meeting on June 24 following, were threefold: (1) to encourage the growth of high schools by raising the requirements for admission to college, and fearlessly enforcing them; (2) to elevate college standards; (3) to bring about among these colleges a unity of educational endeavor. All colleges in the state were declared to be eligible for membership.

At the third annual meeting of the Association in Birmingham, March 24, 1910, the following resolutions were introduced by Doctor Abercrombie and unanimously adopted:

(1) That the following is hereby adopted as the definition of a standard college in Alabama: A college is an institution of learning having a president, and at least six full professors devoting their whole time to the instruction of college classes; a material equipment to the amount of one hundred thousand dollars; an annual income of fifteen thousand dollars; and a four-year course of study in liberal arts and sciences, pure and applied, based upon an entrance requirement of twelve units with three conditions for 1910-11, fourteen units with two conditions for 1911-12, fifteen units with two conditions for 1914-15 and thereafter. (By resolution passed later the requirements were fixed permanently at fourteen units with two conditions.)

(2) That members of the Association pledge themselves to admit by certificate from accredited schools only, and to admit from unaccredited schools by examination only.

(3) That the Association adopt a common list of accredited schools, and a system of uniform examinations for applicants coming from unaccredited schools.

(4) That, for the purpose of selecting a common list of accredited schools and preparing uniform examinations for applicants coming from unaccredited schools, there shall be a joint committee consisting of one member from the faculty of each college belonging to the Association. This committee shall have the power to select and publish a list of accredited schools, and to prepare the questions, make the regulations, and fix the dates for the examination of applicants from unaccredited schools. The faculty of each college shall select its member of the committee.

(5) That each college in the Association shall be held to be in honor bound to abide by this definition and agreement and enforce the implied standards and regulations, so long as it shall remain a member of this Association.

In April, 1910, the Association's committee on entrance met at the University of Alabama, and adopted the following resolutions:

(1) That the committee recommend to the Association that the maximum number of hours required of a professor in a college be fixed at eighteen.

(2) That each college in the Association be requested to submit to the committee through its chairman, by February 15 of each year, a complete list of its newly admitted students, with the school from which each student came, his method of admission, whether by certificate or by examination, and the number of entrance units which he presented.

At a second meeting of this committee, this time at Howard College, in April, 1911, the following resolutions were adopted:

(1) That it is the sense of this committee that proper division should be made in the catalogues of member institutions between college and preparatory students.

(2) That for full affiliation a high school must have a four-year course of study based on seven years of elementary school instruction, with recitation periods forty minutes each; for partial affiliation it must have three years of high school work based on seven years of elementary work, with at least two teachers giving all their time to high school instruction, and with recitation periods forty minutes each.

(3) That (a) students entering any college of the Association from fully accredited schools should not receive more than full freshman standing without examination; (b) students from partially accredited schools should not receive more than twelve units of credit without examination; (c) students from non-accredited schools should not, under any circumstances, received credit without examination.

(4) That the committee adopt a uniform blank for entrance credits, and that the chairman of the committee on entrance be instructed to prepare such blanks and to apportion the expense among the members of the Association.

At the third annual meeting, held in Mobile, in April, 1911, the following resolutions were adopted:

(1) That it is the sense of the Association that high schools, and other institutions of like grade calling themselves colleges, should not be allowed to give academic degrees.

(2) That the secretary of state be, and hereby is, respectfully requested to grant no charters nor clauses of charters by which these institutions may be permitted to grant degrees.

At the next meeting, held in Birmingham in 1912, the following resolutions were adopted:

(1) That the Association print annually a bulletin in which are given the names, the addresses, and the entrance units, with the names of the institutions in which they were obtained, of all new students admitted to the various colleges belonging to the Association. (Later amended to include "class entered").

(2) That in case a student transfers from one college in the Association to another, a certificate of honorable discharge, accompanied by the grades he has received, be required.

(3) That the Association adopt the same regulation regarding the admission of special students as that of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States.

(4) That the Association, in executive session, do hereby memorialize the legislature of Alabama to establish by statute, and to enforce by appropriate penalties, a uniform standard of requirements for entrance and graduation in the degree-conferring institutions of the state.

At the next annual meeting, held in Montgomery in March, 1913, the following resolutions were adopted:

(1) That not more than one unit's credit be allowed for any A course given in the colleges of the Association, and that all such courses embrace at least three one-hour recitation periods throughout a full college year.

(2) That the colleges belonging to the Association admit no student on certificate from a high school in another state, unless the high school from which the student comes is on the accredited list of the state university of that state.

(3) That the Association adopt the following definition of a unit: "A unit represents a year's study in any subject in a secondary school, constituting approximately a quarter of a full year's work." This standard of measurement "takes the four-year high school as a basis and assumes that the length of the school year is from thirty-six to forty weeks, that a period is from forty to sixty minutes in length, and that the study is pursued for four or five periods a week." (This means that not more than four units credit may be given for a single year's work in the high school.)

(4) That no college in the Association classify higher than freshman any student who has not received credit for at least one half-year's work in a standard college or other higher institution of learning, subsequent to graduation from a standard high school.

At the annual meeting held in Birmingham in April, 1914, the following resolutions were adopted:

(1) That the president, the secretary-treasurer, and the chairman of the committee on admission constitute the executive committee of the Association.

(2) That no school be added to or removed from the list of accredited schools unless such action is approved by the executive committee.

(3) That the executive committee examine, or appoint some one to examine, the methods of admission and of keeping the records of students in the various colleges belonging to the Association, with a view to reporting to the Association at its next meeting such recommendations as the committee may see fit.

In the account given above of the action taken in the Montgomery meeting of March, 1913, it is stated that, in addition to other information, all high school reports should give the class to which each student was admitted. Accordingly, in the bulletin of 1913 such information is given in regard to all new students admitted in 1912-13. It is interesting to note that, in the list of thirty-four new students admitted by one of the member institutions, 10 were declared to have been irregularly admitted to the sophomore class on high school certificates. That the publicity given to this irregularity had a beneficial effect, not only on the institution criticized, but also on the other institutions, is evidenced by the fact that, in the report made by the committee on admissions the following year, there were only two irregularities in the entire association.

It is to be regretted that we can not speak positively in regard to the original membership of the Association. In 1912 the membership consisted of seven institutions; Athens College, Birmingham College, Howard College, Judson College, Southern University, University of Alabama, and Woman's College. Presumably, all seven of these institutions took part in the founding of the Association in 1908. In the bulletin of 1925 two additional members are listed: Alabama College and Alabama Polytechnic Institute.

The bulletins on file do not indicate precisely the year or years when these two institutions were admitted. Alabama College became a member of the Southern Association in 1925 and it was probably admitted to the Association of Alabama Colleges that year or the preceding year. The 1925 bulletin likewise states that the four state normal schools were invited to attend all annual meetings of the Association, as was also the State Department of Education. At a meeting at Birmingham in 1925 committees were appointed (a) to study the question of extension courses; (b) to consider the advisability of further limiting the number and kind of courses offered in summer sessions; (c) to see that high school athletes be required to meet precisely the same standards as other high school students; and (d) to revise the standards of senior college membership in the Association. At the same meeting a resolution was adopted to the effect that St. Bernard College be admitted to membership as soon as it was accepted for membership by the Southern Association; and that, pending action by the Southern Association, St. Bernard graduates be admitted without examination to the junior class of colleges in the Association.

At the 1926 meeting, it was voted to require the normal schools to submit to the committee on entrance reports of the Association the same information about all new students that was being submitted by member colleges. At the same meeting Spring Hill College was elected to membership, and Marion Institute was granted the same privileges as St. Bernard College relative to admission of its graduates without examination to the junior class in member institutions. It was further voted, however, that no such privilege be granted to any junior college after the close of 1926-27. It was voted further that the standards for senior colleges in our state Association be the same as the standards for senior colleges in the Southern Association, and that member institutions which do not now maintain these standards be given three years to make the changes necessary to meet them. One may add that the 1926 meeting is noteworthy for the fact that it instituted the practice of having papers and addresses delivered by representatives of the member institutions.

At the 1927 meeting Marion Institute was admitted as a junior college, and at the 1929 meeting the four normal schools were invited to join as junior colleges. At this meeting it was also voted, at the request of the president of Athens College, to defer for three years the regulation adopted in 1926, that all member institutions should qualify for membership in the Southern Association by 1929.

By 1927 the number of accredited secondary schools had increased very greatly. The question of admission to college and the problem of admitting colleges to membership in the Association were not so acute. The committee on entrance records was continued, however, until 1937. The list of freshmen admitted to the member institutions of the Association, together

with the method by which they were admitted, was not published after the meeting in 1932. By this date at least two institutions were extended the privileges of the Association, before they were admitted to the regional accrediting agency. At the twenty-seventh annual meeting, held in 1934, the following recommendations were presented and approved for membership in the Association by the committee on standards:

(1) That any higher institution in Alabama that requires for admission the satisfactory completion of a four-year course in an approved secondary school with credit for fifteen units, or of a three-year course in an approved senior high school with credit for twelve units, or the equivalent as shown by examination; and for graduation the satisfactory completion of a four-year course with credit for one hundred and twenty semester hours, shall be eligible for membership as a senior college.

(2) That any higher institution in Alabama that requires for admission the credit stated above, and for graduation the completion of a two-year course, with credit for sixty semester hours, shall be eligible for admission as a junior college.

(3) That a standing committee on admission of new members be appointed, consisting of one representative of a liberal arts college, one of a technical institute, one of a teacher's college, and one of a junior college, to which committee all applications for membership shall be submitted.

At the same meeting Dean Barnwell submitted the following recommendation, which was adopted: "That the maximum credit granted by a senior college of this Association for work done in a junior college be one-half the total number of hours required for its corresponding bachelor's degree."

At the twenty-ninth annual meeting, held on April 11, 1936, Snead Junior College was admitted to membership, but the matter of credits was referred to a special committee. The special committee, composed of Dean Barnwell, Dean Hale, Dean Napier, Dean Pace, Dean Wood, Dean Smith, and Registrar Edwards, after withdrawing for deliberation on the matter, recommended that the freshman year's work then being done at Snead Junior College be credited by member colleges of the Association, provided the student completes the second year's work at one of the standard colleges with an average grade of *C*. The recommendation was approved.

Since that time any college in the state has been admitted to the Association as soon as a committee of the Association has worked out a plan for the transfer of credits. In each case the method of transfer of credits has followed somewhat the pattern set for Snead Junior College prior to its admission to the Southern Association. Southern Union College, Sacred Heart Junior College, and Walker Junior College were admitted before they became members of the regional accrediting agency. They were admitted with the following plan for the transfer of credits: "Students from these institutions that transfer to other colleges of the state are to be given conditional credit, and in order to get final credit the student must take a full course of study for nine months and make no grade below *C* in any course. If a student makes below *C* in one or more courses, the amount

of credit will be proportionately reduced. It is understood that the student who does not want to follow this plan may seek admission and advanced standing by examination." At the meeting that was held on May 13, 1944, one senior college and three junior colleges that were not members of the regional accrediting agency held membership in the Association.

The minutes of the eighteenth annual session show that a committee on intelligence tests made a report. It states that most of the member colleges were using intelligence tests but not the same test. It was recommended that these tests be continued with a view to the eventual adoption of one standard test. This was in 1925 and it is possible that the committee had been in existence for some time. The records show that some member institutions had a small number of special students and of non-graduates of high schools.

By this time some of the secondary schools were giving courses in Bible. The Association voted that not more than one unit in Bible should be accepted for college entrance, and that the individual college should decide whether the course pursued entitled the student to such credit.

At the next meeting, which was held in Birmingham, on Saturday, April 10, 1926, Doctor Jas. S. Thomas, of the University, reported for the committee on extension courses. The Association adopted his recommendation that courses should not be given except by regularly appointed members of the faculty. The committees on summer schools and on intelligence tests were continued. The question of summer high school standards was referred to the committee on summer schools and Mr. Spencer, the State High School Supervisor, was made a member of this committee. It prepared standards that were adopted at the annual meeting the next year.

At the annual meeting in 1927 the Association voted to adopt the policy of cancelling the registration of any student whose entrance credits were not received within thirty days after his enrollment. Also, the director of secondary education was asked to notify high school principals of the policy of the Association which required that certificates of recommendation be sent direct to the authorities of the institution.

Beginning in 1922 the State Supervisor of Secondary Education presented a study of high school graduates and college entrance. This included the percentage entering for each year, the number who dropped out before the end of the first semester, the number passing all subjects and the total number of failures. The secondary schools were ranked on the basis of the success in college work of the students from each high school. This report has been modified during the years but it has always been presented.

Grading in the colleges came in for consideration also. As early as 1926 an analysis of the grades given in the member institutions for the first quarter or semester was presented to the Association by a committee appointed for that purpose. During the early years each college was designated by a

Roman numeral; but later a resolution was passed authorizing the committee to use the name of the institution and to show the analysis of its grades, giving the percentage of *A*'s, *B*'s, *C*'s, *D*'s, *E*'s, and *F*'s. This report was continued until 1936. At the meeting in 1927 the following resolution was passed:

"In view of the wide variation in the grading as carried out by institutions in Alabama, and in view of the importance of uniformity if we wish to develop a morale for high scholarship, the committee wishes to submit for discussion the following distribution of grades as a standard for the Alabama Association: *A* from 3-10%; *B* from 15-30%; *C* from 30-60%; *D* from 15-30%; and *E* and *F* from 3-10%, when *E* is a condition and *F* is a failure."

The recommendation was adopted. A report on the analysis of grades was made at each annual meeting until the year 1936 when it was discontinued. The members of the Association felt that the publicity had rendered most faculties conscious of the wide variation in grading and that the purposes of the report had been achieved.

By 1929 the committee on standard tests reported a uniform testing program that included the Coöperative English Test as well as an aptitude test. Out of this grew the Joint Testing Program of the Alabama Colleges Association and the Association of Secondary School Principals. The colleges administered the tests to freshmen during the orientation program and a large number of high schools gave an aptitude test to the members of the senior class during the early part of the year. The names and addresses of the secondary school pupils who displayed superior aptitude for college work as shown by this test were supplied each college early enough in the year for the students to be solicited for the following school year. This report together with the success and failure of freshman students during the first quarter or semester has been published from year to year by the Association of Colleges and a copy has been sent to each county and city superintendent as well as to each high school principal.

The Association of Alabama Colleges coöperated in the experiment conducted by the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research of the Southern Association in its plan for a coöperative study by high schools and colleges of a modified secondary program. A resolution was passed which permitted the three experimental schools in the state to depart from traditional practices where such departure seemed desirable. The students from these schools were admitted without the enforcement of certain specific regulations which might be in conflict.

At the thirty-ninth annual meeting, which was held in Birmingham, April 11, 1936, Dean Zebulon Judd raised a question as to the scope and function of the Association of Alabama Colleges. He suggested that a committee be

appointed to study these matters. Doctor Guy E. Snavely moved that such a committee be appointed. At the next meeting, which was held in Birmingham on April 3, 1937, the committee made its report. The report as finally approved at that meeting of the Association placed the work in the hands of the following commissions:

1. Commission on orientation in higher education:
 - (1) History and development of higher education,
 - (2) The philosophy of higher education, and
 - (3) Present trends and problems in higher education;
2. Commission on psychology and techniques in higher institutions, including examinations and grading;
3. Commission on curricular development;
4. Commission on college administration;
5. Commission on entrance requirements, recruiting, and secondary relations;
6. Commission on summer schools; and
7. Commission on extra-mural instruction.

The president of the Association was to appoint the members of the several commissions and they were to begin at once to study some aspect of their problems. Not all of the commissions were to report annually, but each commission should ask to report when it had findings of value. Before concluding the discussion of the plan of reorganization, the following resolution was presented and passed by the Association: "For orientation purposes, it is recommended that every year some distinguished speaker and scholar, well-informed in one of the fields covered by these commissions, be invited to address the Association. In the course of years each commission will have had a representative of its particular field to appear before the Association."

In recent years the number of commissions has been reduced. At present, there are only two of the original commissions. They are now called the Committee on Instruction and the Committee on College and Secondary Relations. The Association is now using some special committees that have been raised as a result of new problems that are being faced by education. One of these is a committee on veteran's re-education, and another is a committee on sound credit for military experience.

The Association has not limited its activities to the work that might fall under these committees but has felt free to consider current problems as they arise. For example, a special meeting of the Association was held on October 15, 1941. This followed the first Work Conference that had been held at Sewanee, Tennessee. Its purpose was to receive a report of that conference and to get a preview of the one that was being planned for the

summer of 1942. The report was in the nature of a panel, and some of those who had been most active in the Work Conference were present. Chancellor O. C. Carmichael, Vanderbilt University, made a preliminary statement and presented the following members of the panel: Doctor Goodrich C. White, Emory University; Doctor Roscoe E. Parker, University of Tennessee; Mr. Noble Hendrix, Birmingham; Doctor Gladstone Yeuell, University of Alabama; and Doctor L. Frazer Banks, Birmingham. The discussions were organized around the problems of instruction, modification of curriculum and degree requirements, the evaluation of student work, guidance, and teacher education. Dean K. J. Hoke, chairman of the committee on work conferences, was presented to the Association and spoke briefly on the significance of the Work Conferences and offered suggestions on the coördination and the development of such studies as the colleges might wish to undertake during the year.

At the thirty-seventh annual meeting of the Association, held in Montgomery, May 13, 1944, the general topic was "Postwar Education Problems." Only one of the committees made a report. The speakers included a representative of the United States Office of Education, the State Superintendent of Education, a representative of the Veterans Administration, and the president of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, as well as representatives from local institutions and organizations.

For many years the meeting of the Association has been held in April or May. At the last meeting, however, a resolution was passed changing the date of the meeting so that it will coincide with the meeting of the Alabama Education Association, which is held in March.

No effort seems to have been made to keep anything like an accurate history of the Association. Even a list of its officers is not available.* As indicated above, Doctor John W. Abercrombie, while serving as president of the University of Alabama, appears to have been active in its organization. He probably served as president during its early history. In 1914-15, Doctor Andrew Sledd, Southern University, was president and Doctor Jas. J. Doster, University of Alabama, was secretary. Beginning with the school year 1925-26, the list of officers is available. In each case the president served for one year and the secretary, or secretary-treasurer, as he is now called, has been the continuing officer. The presidents over this period were: 1925-26, President W. D. Agnew, Woman's College; 1926-27, President Guy E. Snively, Birmingham-Southern; 1927-28, President O. C. Carmichael, Alabama College; 1928-29, Dean Zebulon Judd, Alabama Polytechnic Institute; 1929-30, Dean T. H. Napier, Alabama College; 1930-31, Dean G. W. Mead, Birmingham-Southern; 1931-32, Doctor W. L.

* Anyone having knowledge of the early lists of officers would perform an appreciated service by reporting such lists to the QUARTERLY.—EDITOR.

Spencer, Director of Secondary Education; 1932-33, Doctor W. E. Bohannon, Howard College; 1933-34, Dean C. H. Barnwell, University of Alabama; 1934-35, Dean P. P. Burns, Howard College; 1935-36, Dean Zebulon Judd, Alabama Polytechnic Institute; 1936-37, Doctor W. D. Agnew, Woman's College; 1937-38, Doctor L. G. Cleverdon, Judson College; 1938-39, Doctor John R. McLure, University of Alabama; 1939-40, Registrar Charles W. Edwards, Alabama Polytechnic Institute; 1940-41, Dean Andrew C. Smith, Spring Hill College; 1941-42, Dean Wyatt W. Hale, Birmingham-Southern; 1942-43, Dean C. B. Collier, Florence State Teachers College; 1943-44, President Hubert Searcy, Huntingdon College; and 1944-45, Executive Secretary Ralph B. Draughon.

As stated earlier the secretary appears to have been the continuing officer. Dean Rupert Taylor, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, served as secretary-treasurer from 1925 to 1927. He was followed by Registrar B. L. Shi, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, who served until the school year 1933-34, when Dean L. E. Williams, Woman's College, was elected. He served until the school year of 1936-37, when Dean T. H. Napier, Alabama College, was chosen as secretary-treasurer and has continued to serve in that capacity up to the present.

A casual examination of its history indicates that the Association has followed the aims and purposes of its organization. It has encouraged the growth and development of secondary schools, has tried to elevate college standards, and has attempted to bring about a unity of purpose rather than uniformity among the higher institutions of the state. There is no evidence that the Association has tried to exercise authority other than that of publicity and public discussion. It has been a means of disseminating information on special problems and movements in education and has served as a clearing house for many problems in secondary and higher education.

The Tennessee College Association

By C. HODGE MATHES

Professor of Modern Languages, East Tennessee State College

It used to be said jocularly that Tennessee had more colleges, universities, academies, seminaries, and institutes to the square mile than any other state in the Union. It can be asserted more seriously that Tennessee set the pace for higher learning for all the vast area west of the Appalachians.

Three Tennessee colleges, Washington, Tusculum, and Blount (now the University of Tennessee) are even older than the state itself, and a fourth, Maryville, is this year rounding out a century and a quarter of existence. Eight of the thirty colleges now holding membership in the Tennessee College Association were founded before the Civil War, and four others in the first decade after that war. Twenty-one of these same thirty were established before 1900, which means that they have been in existence for at least half a century.

Of the remaining nine, four are state institutions set up between 1910 and 1915, the youngest of them, Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, being now just under thirty years old. All the five other younger member institutions date back at least two decades.

Despite the long span of life and service of these thirty Tennessee colleges and universities—and these include all but five of the institutions in the state doing work of college grade—the state lagged behind most of the rest in bringing into being a state-wide association of her higher institutions. The Tennessee College Association, indeed, was not formed until 1919. The Association, however, really had its beginnings some five years earlier, being the outgrowth and extension of the Association of East Tennessee Colleges. This earlier regional body, in turn, had grown, somewhat incidentally, out of the college section of the East Tennessee Education Association. Nevertheless, neither the Association of East Tennessee Colleges nor the present state-wide Tennessee College Association came into existence just by chance or by merely following the current fashion of setting up an organization because it seemed a proper thing to do.

The historian, however, who would seek to discover the real why's and wherefore's of the establishment of the Tennessee College Association (hereafter designated as T.C.A.) would have to make his search elsewhere than in the constitution and by-laws of that body. To be sure, Article II of said constitution sets forth the "object" of the Association thus: "the advancement of the cause of higher education by the promotion of interests common to the colleges of Tennessee"; but that statement is about as specific as a typical "plank" in a political platform. It throws but a feeble ray of light on

what the founders of the Association were thinking about at the time or were hoping for as the end-result of their efforts. Neither would the perusal of the twenty-odd published volumes of Proceedings of the T.C.A., with their detailed recording of the minutes of each meeting and the full text of most of the papers and addresses presented, give many definite clues to the real urge that led to the original organization. Only in the semi-private correspondence of some of the leading college and university heads and in the mellow reminiscences of some of these same veterans on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Association in 1939, do we begin to unravel the actual story.

The principal factors that really brough the T.C.A. to birth were three: one, a minor; the other two, major. The minor factor was the economic and mental stress of the First World War. Many of the colleges suffered seriously from curtailed enrollments, reduced teaching staffs, and impaired finances. In the immediate aftermath of the War even some of the more substantially endowed institutions saw their revenues dwindling and faced the future with anxiety. Probably a majority of the smaller institutions, which even in normal times led a hand-to-mouth existence, supported on faith and a shoestring, wondered whether each year might not be their last. The old copy-book maxim, "In union there is strength," took on new significance and accentuated the urge to make common cause with one's neighbors who were mostly in similar plight.

The first of the major factors, and the more immediate in its urgency, was the ferment in college and preparatory-school circles produced by the findings of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and by the activities of the General Education Board. Through both these agencies there had come to light the widespread lack of uniformity in higher institutions, especially in the South, in such matters as admission requirements, curriculum, departmental organization, library and laboratory facilities, training of faculty members, sources and security of financial support, management of athletics, and the like. In the "good old days," any school, from the staid and sturdy old-line college with millions of productive endowments to the smallest fly-by-night institute with three or four underpaid or unpaid teachers and a handful of unprepared students, could get itself chartered as a college or university, with a free hand in awarding scholastic degrees upon its graduates and even upon its donors and prospective donors. This was "academic freedom" with a vengeance. The unsavory memory of the "American Temperance University" was still vivid, and was a sore spot in the state pride of Tennesseans when they went abroad.

In 1919, and for a decade preceding, however, those old days were fast becoming a thing of the past. The Carnegie Foundation and the General Education Board, standing as watchdogs over vast sources of potential school revenues that made the mouths of hungry, harried college presidents water,

were asking the impertinent question, "What is a college?" and proposing answers based upon the standards in vogue in the longer-established and better supported institutions of the North and the East. "How much endowment have you? How dependable are your other sources of support? How many volumes have you in your library, and how much equipment in your laboratories? What degrees do your professors hold, and how much are they paid? Where do you get your students, and what documentary evidence of their preparation for college do you have on file?" These were typical questions asked by the agents of the "Foundation" and the "Board." And they weren't always easy to answer to the satisfaction of the "watch-dogs."

Over the country, too, groups of colleges, usually the oldest and best, were forming voluntary "associations," setting up "standards" of various categories, and then proceeding to admit other colleges if and when these latter were found to meet the "standards" of the original group. As the numbers of member colleges in each association grew, so grew also their prestige and their influence in the educational community. They became "accrediting bodies," and the presence or absence of their stamp of approval helped mightily to make or to mar the chances for growth and even for existence of the non-member institutions. Even the son of the plowman began to realize that if he gravitated to the local crossroads college he might find that other schools would refuse to recognize, or "credit," the work he had done. And when enough plowmen's sons became aware of that risk they deserted the crossroads college, and soon the college had to fold up.

This wasn't entirely fair in every case, of course. Undoubtedly there were some very small, very poor schools that struggled through the years on the sheer faith and consecration of scholarly teachers who taught capable and ambitious pupils in the finest tradition of Arnold of Rugby and Mr. Chips. Still, it was inevitable that there must be set up some "standards" if educational efficiency on a broad democratic scale was ever to be maintained, and it was generally recognized that while enforcement of standards might inflict hardships upon some individual institutions, the good results accomplished would adequately compensate for minor injustices.

That this uneasiness as to "standards" was a prime motive leading to the establishment of the T.C.A., was clearly brought out in much of the correspondence now on file in the office of the Secretary-Treasurer. It was effectively expressed also at the Twentieth Anniversary Meeting in 1939, by Dr. Clinton H. Gillingham, who had served as Secretary-Treasurer during most of the first decade of the Association. In a revealing paper on "The First Ten Years" presented by special request, Dr. Gillingham said *inter alia*:

"In 1919 the fever of standardization was at its worst. The disease had not reached its crisis. Accrediting agencies were all-powerful.

Their good works were evident, but their failings were recognized only by the colleges that could not 'make the grade.' There was need for an organization that could bring together a group of colleges operating within common territorial boundaries for the benefit of all, and for providing such help as was possible, without offense, to the strengthening of the smaller institutions within its membership. This policy created good feeling. No one enjoys the feeling of being left out. Some minimum requirements were necessary for admission to membership, to be sure, but as soon as an institution in Tennessee could convince the Association that the word "college" in its corporate name was not counterfeit, its application for membership was favorably passed upon. Moreover, when once admitted to membership in this Association the smallest college enjoyed the same rights and privileges as did the largest colleges and universities. A wholesome democracy of co-operative effort resulted. A field that an accrediting agency could not, in the nature of the case, find time for was thus opened and cultivated. The twenty standard colleges of liberal arts and the ten junior colleges (in the decade of 1919-29) found common ground for the discussion of the problems of their common task." *

A responsive note on the part of the Southern Association itself had been sounded at the third annual meeting, in a notable address of welcome by Chancellor J. H. Kirkland of Vanderbilt University. Speaking on "The Southern Association of Secondary Schools and Colleges as an Accrediting Association," Chancellor Kirkland, one of the founding fathers and guiding spirits of that Association, said:

"I suppose it is fair to say that every institution in the South that is in striking distance of the Southern Association is trying to get in. I am very hopeful that the standards we have now adopted will remain fixed for maybe a period of ten years, that time will be given for so many institutions that are now working up to work up and to get on the list of members of the Southern Association. There is no credit to any organization of that kind in exclusiveness, none at all. The credit is in helpfulness, in service, in lifting, not in pushing. . . . I think there ought to be a very warm friendship between that Association and the State organizations in all our territory. These State organizations ought to be in a measure preparatory to the larger regional group. That would mean, of course, that you would not have the standards the same as the Southern Association. You would be naturally a part of that larger group, but by lowering standards a little you can bring into coöperative work a large group of institutions that are not able to

* *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting, T.C.A., p. 21.*

get into the Southern Association, and by that helpful coöperation you find that you all move gradually upward." *

In the light of these utterances on the part of two men who were in the best position to voice the thought and feeling that brought the T.C.A. to birth, it is evident that the men of the colleges—especially the smaller institutions—were being hard pressed to effect some sort of organization less impersonal and more sympathetic than a regional body, as a means of aiding the smaller colleges to continue operating without loss of patronage and prestige until they might in time hope to meet the standards of the accrediting associations. That this self-protective urge, together with the coöperative attitude of the Southern Association, saved many of the colleges from extinction and saved the state the serious loss of their services, is clearly shown by the record of the past twenty-five years.

In 1919, when the T.C.A. was formed, there were only five Tennessee colleges holding membership in the Southern Association. These five were Vanderbilt University, the University of the South, the University of Tennessee, Southwestern Presbyterian University, and George Peabody College for Teachers. Today eighteen of the thirty colleges of the T.C.A. have been admitted to full membership in the Southern Association, and five others are listed as non-member colleges approved for teacher-training for member secondary schools. And of the seven colleges not yet eligible for the Southern Association, at least three are members of some other regional or national accrediting body.

Certain it is, then, that the youth of Tennessee would have been much the poorer in cultural opportunities had not these struggling colleges been enabled to survive by reason of the friendly coöperation found in the T.C.A. And what at first seemed a threat to existence proved to be a wholesome and effective stimulus, from which both the colleges and the state have greatly benefitted.

The second major motivating factor in creating the T.C.A. was the growing competition of the newly established state-supported normal schools. Although there had been in existence a State Normal School from the late seventies to the early nineties, operating as a department of the old University of Nashville and supported partly by the Peabody Fund and partly by a small state subsidy, teacher-training in Tennessee was never more than nominally recognized as a state function until the General Education Bill of 1909 made specific provision for three State Normal Schools, one in each grand division of the state. These schools began their work in 1911, and were followed in 1915 by a fourth state institution, the Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, which was also in effect another teacher-training school. Within a decade of their founding these four new schools, offering free tuition

* *Proceedings of the Third Annual Meeting, T.C.A.*, p. 9.

and maintaining subsistence costs at a lower level than was generally possible even in the smaller colleges, had become in a definite sense the "people's colleges," and together with the State University were enrolling a significantly large percentage of the total number of college-grade students in the state.

It was generally recognized by the old-line college administrators that this competition would be permanent and would steadily increase. Furthermore it was assumed that the state normal schools would demand and would receive such a degree of preference in the training and certification of public-school teachers that they might eventually enjoy a virtual monopoly of the teacher-training function.

Admittedly the private and church-related colleges, prior to the epoch-making General Education Bill of 1909, had generally displayed a strange sympathy toward the existing low status of the public-school system. Most of the old-line colleges disregarded the public secondary schools as a source of supply for their own freshman classes. In general the smaller colleges maintained "preparatory departments" as the only dependable "feeders" for a college student body, since public high schools were almost non-existent and the numerous private college-preparatory schools and academies served mainly a hand-picked clientele that gravitated to the largest and strongest old-line colleges or to the State University. While some of the colleges made a gesture of offering a "teachers' course" in connection with the usual liberal arts curriculum, the training of teachers was definitely looked upon as a minor function of the colleges. Such pedagogical courses as were offered were almost purely book-courses, and were often taught by instructors who were either not full members of the college staff or who were lukewarm in their zeal for building up the neglected high schools and the more pitifully neglected elementary schools. Now, however, that the new state schools were magnifying their primary office and glorifying the "professionally trained teacher" as the best hope of a backward state, the old-line colleges became suddenly public-school conscious. They soon realized that while they had officially stressed their training of ministers, doctors, lawyers, engineers, and political leaders, a surprisingly large percentage of their undergraduate students had been coming to college for the immediate purpose, at least, of being certificated to teach in the public schools.

Obviously the normal-school authorities were clearly justified in their vigorous campaign to raise the appallingly low standards of public-school teaching in the shortest time possible, and in their clamoring for new legislation that would most speedily provide a trained teacher for every school-room in the state. It was inevitable that in this zeal of the state-school leaders and the encouraging response of the would-be public-school teachers, the state normal schools should be envisaged as a threat to the very existence of a majority of the smaller colleges. Of course, there were a few

top-ranking liberal-arts institutions, with their classical traditions backed by their substantial endowments, to whom teacher-training for the public schools lay entirely outside their field of interest, and to whom the furor over the encroachment of the state schools was of only academic concern. On the other hand, for more than half the private and church-related institutions it was almost a life-or-death matter. Either they must be allowed to continue the training of teachers as a major function, or they must shut up shop.

This aspect of the situation as it existed in 1919 is infrequently mentioned in any official publications or reports, of either the Association of East Tennessee Colleges or the T.C.A.; but in inner college circles and voluminous private correspondence it was a burning issue. Two decades later, at the Twentieth Annual Meeting of 1939, referred to above, it was touched upon reminiscently by several speakers. It was most frankly expressed by Dean Boyd A. Wise, who had been a foremost promoter of the East Tennessee Association and who was the first Secretary-Treasurer of the T.C.A. In his twentieth-anniversary paper (1939), Dean Wise reviewed the two decades of the Association's growth. His opening paragraphs were as follows:

"The East Tennessee College Association had excluded the normal schools on the grounds that their curriculum did not contain four years' or even two years' work of college grade, but in the main repeated high-school courses with methodology added. This clash of interests between the normal schools and the cultural colleges came to an acute stage when a shrewd politician who headed one of the normals and who boasted that he was 'the third house of the Tennessee Legislature,' had driven through the Legislature measures the effect of which was to exclude graduates of the liberal-arts colleges from teaching in the high schools unless they repeated the high-school subjects with methodology added. The effect of this measure, together with the political control of certification, would have been to force college graduates intending to teach to take post-graduate courses in methods at some normal school, or to force the arts colleges to become partly normal schools in order to graduate teachers.

"At its 1918 meeting the East Tennessee College Association saw the necessity of forming a state-wide association of colleges if they were to maintain their right to train teachers. . . . It must have been apparent to 'the third house of the Legislature' that this new organization would be a force he would have to reckon with; for he began to placate it and to seek admittance to it, with the result that membership was granted to his institution at the 1921 meeting in Knoxville.

"A more pacific mood was apparent in the Association at its second meeting in Chattanooga in 1920. Dean Boyd of Milligan College,

who had been until then rather militant, said it should be the purpose of the T.C.A. to foster a finer spirit of coöperation and to utilize to better advantage all the educational resources of the state. President Watters of Union University deplored the harmful rivalry between church and state, destructive criticism of the State by the church colleges, and sharp political advantages over the church colleges taken by the State in its anti-church attitude."

These quotations from the first secretary-treasurer of the T.C.A. emphasize the fact that while a feeling of rivalry, not to say sharp antipathy, contributed definitely to bringing about the state organization, there appeared even at the beginning a counteracting spirit of reconciliation and friendly coöperation that boded well for the new Association. It was most fortunate that among the more prominent leaders in both the liberal-arts colleges and the state institutions there were broad-minded, clear-visioned educational statesmen who opposed exclusiveness and sought coöperative effort in all the higher schools. To quote still another paragraph from Dean Wise:

"Dean Hoskins of the University of Tennessee spoke of the value of getting together and understanding our common tasks. He deplored the great loss due to aloofness. . . . Noteworthy, if one remembers the original purpose of the East Tennessee Association, was the motion of Dr. Diehl (of Southwestern Presbyterian University), which was affirmed, that the Superintendent of Public Education and the presidents of the state normal schools be invited to attend. . . . Noteworthy also was Article VIII of the new Constitution adopted in 1920: 'Any standard or junior college or qualified normal school in the state may make application to the Executive Committee, and upon recommendation of said Committee may be admitted by a two-thirds vote of the institutions that are members'."

Dr. Gillingham also included the following statement in his excellent summary of "the abiding values of this Association" in the paper "The First Ten Years" from which we have already quoted:

"First in point of time, preëminent in spiritual value, and permanent in effect, is the creating of a sympathetic, common understanding among the institutions making up the membership of this Association. Earlier than the natal day of the state-wide organization, when only a handful of like-minded men gathered to form the East Tennessee College Association, President Hoskins, then Dean of the University of Tennessee, made an immortal remark. As nearly as I can recall it, he said: 'We should know each other better; we might like one another.'"

"Whether the truth of the Dean's far-reaching statement be self-

evident, I am not sure. I know that it was demonstrated over and over again in this Association long before the decade of 1919-29 came to an end. At an earlier day not a few officers and faculties who should have known better shared in their students' jealousies, distrusts, and suspicions of nearby rival institutions. The annual meeting together of presidents, deans, and other representatives of the member institutions developed natural, though latent, respect each for the other; brought into operation the Christian virtue of forbearance, created a desire and will to cooperate, and led to interacting helpfulness and lasting friendships." *

The general conclusion from all these citations from the pioneers of the Association is that while anxieties, suspicions, and animosities operated as driving forces in bringing the colleges into a union, the spirit of good will that prevailed from the beginning promptly disarmed the forces of disunion and developed an atmosphere of mutual understanding and friendly cooperation. Had the T.C.A. not accomplished anything other than to surround its members with such an atmosphere, it would fully have justified its establishment.

Once under way, after such auspicious beginnings, the Association promptly swung into action. Its organization was simple and effective. It elected annually a president, a vice-president, and two members of the executive committee. Triennially it elected a secretary-treasurer, the only paid officer. These five officials constituted the executive committee, whose duty it was to select a place and time for the next annual meeting, prepare a program, consider applications for membership and make recommendations as to accepting or rejecting such applications at the annual meeting.

The annual meetings were from the first, and still are, limited in attendance. Each member institution sends one voting delegate—usually the president or some other administrative officer—and may send as many non-voting delegates as it may desire. The average attendance has been two delegates for each institution. A small number of other visitors, mainly local residents of the meeting place, usually attends the sessions. The entire gathering, therefore, generally numbers from fifty to sixty. Obviously, then, the sessions are not occasions for speech-making, but are conferences of responsible representatives gathered to consider and take action upon specific problems affecting the colleges. For several years the two-day meetings have been held at Vanderbilt University at the Easter season immediately preceding the meeting of the Tennessee Education Association. Much of the most constructive work of the T.C.A. has always been done by special committees appointed by the President to make studies, gather information, or recommend formal action.

* *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting*, p. 20.

Some of the early undertakings of the Association were the preparation of uniform admission blanks and transfer blanks for students in all member colleges, the setting up of requirements for admission to membership in the Association either as standard or as junior colleges, the adoption of eligibility rules for intercollegiate athletic contests, and the study of means to promote higher scholarship standards throughout the state.

From the earliest years the annual membership dues were fixed at a nominal figure, which has averaged about twenty-dollars for a four-year institution and fifteen for a junior college. The funds thus provided have sufficed to pay the small salary of the secretary-treasurer, bear the costs of printing programs and the proceedings of each annual meeting, and defray the traveling expenses of occasional invited speakers from outside the state.

Although the Association promptly adopted and published its "standards and definitions" as a basis for the admission of new members, it has never regarded itself as primarily an accrediting body. To be sure, the standards adopted, which are only slightly lower than those of the Southern Association, have been adhered to with considerable fidelity, in several instances to the extent of excluding institutions not regarded as meeting them. In most instances the application of such a college has been rejected on one of two grounds: either the absence of convincing evidence of maintaining proper requirements of admission from secondary schools, or the lack of dependable sources of income sufficient to give promise of permanence and growth.

The most ambitious project upon which the Association embarked in its earliest years was the sponsorship and publication of the first comprehensive survey of higher education in Tennessee. At the first annual meeting, at the University of Chattanooga (1919), a paper was presented by President George A. Hubbell of Lincoln Memorial University on the subject, "A Self-Survey for Tennessee Colleges." In this paper Dr. Hubbell made a frank disclosure of the fact that the colleges of the state had grown up as local institutions wholly independent of each other and with no clear picture of the educational status of the community as a whole or of specific educational needs.

At the second meeting, at the University of Tennessee, Dr. P. P. Claxton, at that time United States Commissioner of Education, in a challenging address revealed some disconcerting school conditions in the state on the authority of statistics taken from state reports and studies made by the Federal Bureau of Education. The Association at this same meeting adopted a resolution "to gather information with reference to the status of higher education in Tennessee at the present time."

At the third meeting (1922), at the George Peabody College in Nashville, the resolution was repeated and the discussion of the question was continued, though no action was taken further than to urge the speeding of plans

to secure, if possible, the aid of the Federal Bureau in making a state-wide survey.

The next year, at the meeting at Maryville College, saw the plan well on the road to realization. Dr. George F. Zook, then Chief of the Division of Higher Education of the U. S. Bureau of Education, in an address on "The Survey of Colleges in Tennessee," outlined a definite plan of procedure, which is set forth in these quotations from the report of the Executive Committee:

"We are recommending that the survey of Tennessee Colleges be undertaken under the following conditions:

"1. That each institution participating is to pay \$100 . . . not later than September 15, 1923.

- - - - -

"The expenses are to include traveling expenses of the surveyors, stenographic assistants, the publication of the full report, and *honoraria* for persons assisting from outside the Bureau of Education. It is understood that we are receiving without expense the services of the representatives of the Bureau.

"The purpose of the survey shall be:

(a) To make a sympathetic and constructive study of the higher-education system in Tennessee.

(b) To determine the demand and need for higher education.

(c) To determine to what extent this need is now being met.

(d) To suggest means of improvement, and to outline an educational policy for our higher-education system.

(e) To study such other things as seem related to the problems of higher education."

The survey was well under way at the time of the fifth annual meeting in 1924, and within that year the field work was completed and preliminary reports were available for study and criticism. By the spring of 1925 the survey report, now nearing completion, was made the basis of the entire program of the sixth annual meeting, at Carson and Newman College. The completed report was ready before the seventh annual meeting and was published in the summer of that year, 1926.

The publication of the "Survey of Higher Education in Tennessee" created a deep and sobering impression upon the thinking citizenship of the State and produced significant repercussions upon all the higher institutions. Its effects were reflected also in many newspaper editorials and even in state and regional assemblies of various church groups. The T.C.A. had taken the lid off, and the public was astonished, not to say appalled, by the fumes that came from the steaming pot! To begin with, the survey fully corroborated the earlier findings of the Bureau of Education relative

to some conditions that prevailed throughout the nation and particularly in certain states. It revealed, in short, that in the quarter of a century preceding the date of the survey, Tennessee had not only made no progress but had actually retrogressed in college and university attendance in proportion to its population. More bluntly put, in 1920-21 Tennessee "ranked exactly forth-ninth—that is at the bottom of the list of the states in the proportion of its population which was seeking the advantages of higher learning."

Obviously it was high time that the leaders of the cultural life in the state should set about to determine the cause, or causes, for this unenviable distinction. And it was everywhere recognized that such a body as the T.C.A. was the logical—in fact the only—organization really in position to sponsor the investigation and to plan measures for bettering the situation.

As we have seen, the plan for financing the survey, save for the gratuitous and indispensable guidance provided by the U. S. Bureau of Education, was by the assessment of a survey fee of \$100 upon each member institution. In this connection it is interesting to note that according to the report of Secretary Gillingham, on July 1, 1926, twenty-two of the thirty member colleges had accepted the assessment and thus participated in the project. Incidentally, the eight non-participating members included the three state normal schools—recently become state teachers colleges—and the fourth state school at Cookeville; in fact, all the state institutions except the University of Tennessee. It is a matter of record that the four state colleges could not accept the assessment laid upon them without special authorization of the State Board of Education, and this Board was reluctant to spend the \$400 involved out of appropriations already meager and mostly allocated to other necessary budget purposes. It is indicative of the good understanding that had healed the old breach between state and non-state schools, that this non-participation in the first major enterprise of the Association was nowhere seriously regarded as lack of a coöperative spirit.

It is, of course, outside the province of this sketch to dwell upon the findings of the survey. It is important, however, to record that the T.C.A. found therein much food for reflection. For the first time the colleges had, as it were, an aerial map of the whole area they were intended to serve. They were able to see clearly the existing distribution of higher institutions throughout the state, and to recognize that the diffusion of higher-education opportunities, while somewhat uneven, was in general a normal reflection of popular interest in education. It was made clear also that the state needed few if any more colleges. In fact, in certain areas there were almost certainly too many—more, at least than could reasonably expect to do much further growing. One section of the report contained this conclusion:

"There is a surprising diffusion of colleges in the mountain section of the state. This condition probably reflects two factors: first, the

earlier settlement and economic development of East Tennessee; and second, the strong religious interest in education, especially the Presbyterian, in that section. . . . The scattered locations of the colleges and universities should stimulate college attendance, for it is now well established that most students in college come from within a relatively small distance of the college which they attend. . . . It seems clear that the low college attendance in Tennessee is not to be attributed to the location of the institutions; in fact, in the future the location of the college will probably not be as important in its effects on college attendance as it was in earlier times."

Another section concluded thus:

"So far as has been learned, only two denominations, the Baptist and the Methodist Episcopal, seem to have made any obvious attempt to coördinate their higher-education activity in the state. The lack of denominational policy is most likely responsible for the multiplication of institutions at the expense of their strength. It is, therefore, suggested that each religious denomination, and especially each denomination which now has several colleges and universities, consider the adoption of a policy of coördination and control."

It was such findings and such conclusions drawn from them—and the number could be multiplied many fold—that promptly began to bear fruit in the colleges themselves, in the church councils behind many of them, and in the thinking of the responsible citizenry. Proof is not lacking, though the limitations of space forbid its introduction here, that the entire policy of several colleges in the Association underwent definite changes promptly upon the publication of the survey. A perusal of the programs of the annual meetings for the years immediately following reveals that many—in several instances a majority—of the topics chosen for discussion were directly inspired by the survey. Numerous special and standing committees undertook the study of some of the problems and suggestions brought out in Dr. Zook's report. It is not an overstatement to say that for the Association and its membership the survey was epoch-making.

Meanwhile, as the entire educational outlook in the State and the nation broadened in the tense years filled with anxieties about the future of democratic institutions in Europe and shadowed by forebodings of a second world conflict, the sessions of the Association devoted increasing attention to internal concerns believed to be vital for American colleges. The annual programs came more and more to be built around topics like these: "The Place of the Liberal Arts Course in Education for Democracy"; "The Strengthening of Scholarship in Our Colleges"; "The Improvement of

College Teaching"; "Moral and Spiritual Values in American Education"; and "How Our Colleges Can Best Serve the Rural Community."

As the published volumes of "Proceedings" will show, there was an increasing emphasis in the papers and addresses presented upon the necessity of making college studies, college teaching, and college life more vital and productive of high culture, sound citizenship, and useful service. Also the practical administrative problems demanded and received thoughtful consideration, through such program topics as these: "The Value of Standardized Tests and of Comprehensive Examinations"; "Needed Revision of Teacher-training Curricula and State Certification Standards"; and "The Ethics of College Advertising and of Solicitation of Students."

And while the T.C.A. eschewed political partisanship as conscientiously as it avoided religious sectarianism, it frequently appointed special committees to confer with state officials and to prepare resolutions favoring or opposing educational bills pending in the Legislature. The private and church-related colleges were particularly active in seeking to secure for their own graduates certification privileges on equal terms with the graduates of the state teachers colleges. In this they have been notably successful. Indeed, one might almost say that the requirements and restrictions placed upon state-school applicants for teaching positions are even greater than those for applicants trained in liberal arts colleges.

With the entry of the United States into the present World War the colleges of the T.C.A. naturally felt the impact as did all the higher institutions of the country. The story of the manifold ways in which they sought to adapt their programs to the emergency and to render practical service to the Allied cause is too long to be told here. At the request of the writer, the present Secretary-Treasurer Dr. Paul L. Palmer of the University of Chattanooga, condensed the chief activities of the colleges during wartime into a brief resumé, which it seems proper to insert here.

ACTIVITIES OF THE TENNESSEE COLLEGE ASSOCIATION, 1942-44

By Paul L. Palmer, Secretary-Treasurer

As would be expected, the activities of the Association have been strongly influenced by the war, and particularly the administrative problems created among colleges by the war. The critical examination of curriculum procedures, strongly evident in college circles in the decade before Pearl Harbor and reflected in our own territory in the stimulating conferences held at Sewanee in the summers of 1941 and 1942, rapidly gave way to the radical readjustments occasioned by our participation in the war. To date this readjustment has had three phases, the first two of which were emphasized in the annual meetings of 1942 and 1943, and the third occupying the attention of our members at the present moment. These three phases are:

First.—The attempt to adapt existing curricula to the needs of the national emergency. This movement was reflected in the mushrooming of scores of new courses, aimed to prepare the prospective service man for combat service, and especially to grapple with the needs of prospective officer material. Many of our institutions became hosts for the introduction of varied "defense training" courses to meet both armed-forces and civilian-defense-worker needs. Physics, mathematics, geography, political science, and history suddenly took on urgent value. Home nursing, health, nutrition, and Red Cross activities were reorganized or hastily made available for the women students. Meantime college administrators were bestirring themselves in the endeavor to enlist the colleges more directly in the war effort. In all of this welter of activity educational thinking was suddenly projected out to include the full implications of the world conflict, a point of view forcefully presented to the Association at the April, 1942, meeting by Chancellor Carmichael of Vanderbilt. Our colleges somewhat reluctantly awoke to a realization that the old conventional pattern of college program and procedure was in need of drastic change and in its traditional form would probably never return.

Second.—By the spring of 1943 most of our member institutions were deeply involved in the Army or Navy service programs, or were engaged in a grim struggle for survival as young men in increasing numbers were inducted into the armed forces. Twelve Army units and three Navy programs were ultimately assigned to Tennessee colleges, accommodating at the peak approximately 4,400 Army Aviation Cadets and 850 Naval trainees. Meantime civilian enrollments in most institutions declined seriously, usually 30 to 60 per cent, and in one instance the college was taken over exclusively for Naval training purposes. While the colleges with service programs "sweated out" the radical innovations and readjustments which the Army and Navy inaugurated, the junior colleges and four-year institutions without service programs struggled to maintain enrollments and succeeded for the most part beyond their expectations. By June, 1944, not a single member had been forced to close its doors. The unique and strenuous experiences of these wartime months were considered to be of such outstanding importance that the program of the November, 1943, meeting was largely devoted to describing and discussing the problems created in this exciting phase of Tennessee college existence.

Third.—As the war progressed, our members began to look and plan ahead. Two addresses at the 1943 meeting lifted the voice of prophecy on the role that colleges should play in the America of the future. The few service men beginning to trickle back to the colleges following discharge from active duty were recognized as the harbingers of a flood of youth who would return to the classroom after demobilization from the Armed Forces or de-

fense industries. Postwar planning committees exist in abundance. Champions of the traditional college values are endeavoring to salvage what they can in the face of strongly entrenched scientific and technological forces which have flourished in the wartime atmosphere. The weaknesses of highly departmentalized curricula have become so apparent and the futility of so much prewar training for prosperity so strongly felt by former students that energetic measures are now being undertaken to reorganize general education on a more satisfactory basis. In particular are the probable educational needs of returning service men having a powerful effect on curriculum planning for the near future.

As this is being written the Tennessee College Association is giving its full support to the deliberations of the Tennessee State Committee on Post-war Education, sponsored by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. There is a strong probability that the next gathering of the Tennessee College Association will be concerned with problems our colleges face in grappling realistically with the fundamental changes in our civilization which have been brought about by the war.

* * * * *

AFTERWORD

As I offer this brief sketch of the origin, growth, and accomplishments of the Tennessee College Association, I am keenly aware that it is too largely a recital of facts and figures. I wish that it could have been more, a series of personality portraits, which, after all, are the true essence of history.

In my own mind there passes in review, first of all, a goodly procession of spiritual images of nearly a score of the actual founders of the body who have now gone on to who knows what more distinguished Association in the Elsewhere. The bare mention of their names brings a sense of personal loss. Many of these names were as familiar in the broader circle of the Southern Association as in the state organization: James H. Kirkland (Vanderbilt), George A. Hubbell (Lincoln Memorial), H. E. Watters (Union), L. C. Glenn (Vanderbilt), Jasper C. Barnes (Maryville), George F. Burnett (Tennessee College), Bruce R. Payne (Peabody), E. L. Atwood (Tennessee College), John Royal Harris (Cumberland), Oscar Sams (Carson-Newman), Charles O. Gray (Tusculum), B. F. Finney (Sewanee), John D. Blanton (Ward-Belmont), J. W. Brister (Memphis State).

I think, too, and never without a glow of grateful recollection, of some of the Nestors of the Association, who, in Homeric phrase, "having outlived two generations of mortal men, still rule among the third." Most of these are still of our fellowship, prudent in counsel, vigorous in leadership: Charles E. Diehl (Southwestern), James D. Hoskins (University of Tennessee), Edwin Mims (Vanderbilt), George M. Baker (Sewanee), Boyd A. Wise (Lincoln

Memorial), Floyd Bralliar (Madison), Sidney G. Gilbreath (East Tennessee State), Samuel T. Wilson (Maryville), Shelton Phelps (Peabody), Henry J. Derthick (Milligan), Clinton H. Gillingham (Maryville).

There is also a third group of portraits on memory's wall, those of the younger contemporaries who have filled up the thinning lines, comrades by whose side for more than a decade it was my high privilege to march in the ranks. Their names are too numerous to mention here, but at least a score stand out by reason of the particularly close relationship I sustained with them: Alex. Guerry (Chattanooga and Sewanee), O. C. Carmichael and Franklin C. Paschal (Vanderbilt), H. B. Evans (Bethel), Q. M. Smith (Tennessee Polytechnic and Middle Tennessee State), Ralph W. Lloyd and E. R. Hunter (Maryville), James T. Warren and Edgar M. Cook (Carson-Newman), John J. Hurt (Union), A. B. Mackey (Trevecca), James J. Robb and M. F. Stubbs (Tennessee Wesleyan), C. P. Roland (Freed-Hardeman), E. H. Ijams (David Lipscomb), Frank C. Foster (Tusculum), Thomas P. Johnston (King), Charles C. Sherrod (East Tennessee State), Richard E. Womack and M. E. Eagle (Lambuth), Ernest L. Stockton (Cumberland), Paul L. Palmer (University of Chattanooga).

Musing thus in this picture gallery, I find myself borne away upon a turbulent tide of happy memories; and casting aside modesty and strict truthfulness, I become a braggart, exclaiming with Aeneas of old: "*Et quorum pars magna fui!*"

A Brief History of the Mississippi Association of Colleges

BY J. B. YOUNG

President, Jones County Junior College

Compared with similiar associations, the Mississippi Association of Colleges may be young, but in its twenty-three years it has brought about in its member colleges many important improvements, tangible and otherwise. If we could chat with those who are still living who attended the first meeting, we should no doubt be able to add interesting sidelights and many items that are not recorded in the minutes. The minutes, however, and the letters on file show the purposes and the accomplishments and indicate that even greater accomplishments may be hoped for from the Association than have already been achieved.

The earliest record of the Mississippi Association of Colleges is found in the minutes of a meeting held in the courthouse at Meridian, May 5, 1921. Dr. J. C. Fant, who presided, is given credit for conceiving the plan of such an association. Prof. James V. Bowen was elected temporary secretary; Dr. D. M. Key presented the report of the committee on the constitution. (It appears that there must have been a previous meeting at which this committee on the constitution had been appointed.) Another indication of a previous meeting appears in the statement that, "President D. C. Hull moved that the joint committee be authorized and instructed to confer with the State Accrediting Commission in adopting a uniform list of accrediting secondary schools, and uniform entrance examinations for students not eligible to enter on certificate."

Officers elected for the year were: President, Dr. J. C. Fant; Vice President, Dr. D. M. Key; and Secretary, Dean James V. Bowen. The president was appointed to meet with the Accrediting Commission to explain the purpose of this organization and to arrange for coöperation. Colleges named in the constitution who had no representative at the meeting were to be requested to signify to the secretary within sixty days their desire to become charter members. Those present at the first meeting were Dr. J. C. Fant, Mississippi State College for Women; Chancellor J. N. Powers and Dean J. W. Bell, from the University of Mississippi; Dr. D. C. Hull, Dean James V. Bowen, Professors E. S. Towles and A. B. Butts, Agricultural and Mechanical College; Professor D. M. Key and Stuart Noble, Millsaps College; President Joe Cook and Vice President T. P. Scott, State Normal; Miss Means, All Saints'.

The purpose of the Association as stated in the constitution is: "To pro-

mote good will and fellowship among the colleges of Mississippi; to adopt and enforce uniform requirements for admitting students to college; to secure uniform methods of admission; to agree upon preparatory schools to be accredited and upon standards to which these schools shall measure up; to provide uniform examinations and methods of grading papers; to promote such other aims as tend to the promotion of their common interests and purposes." A quotation from Dr. Fant seems apropos, "Our main function, it seems to me, will be to assist in the development of the high schools and the strengthening of the courses in the member colleges."

As to the membership, the constitution says, "The members of this Association shall be the following colleges situated in Mississippi, and such others as shall in the future be admitted: All Saints' College, Mississippi A. & M. College, Belhaven College, Mississippi State College for Women, Blue Mountain College, State Normal College, Millsaps College, University of Mississippi, Grenada College, Whitworth College, Mississippi College, Woman's College. Other notable paragraphs in the Constitution are:

"The character and tone of an institution are factors of consequence in determining eligibility."

"Each institution shall be required once every three years, at the request of the executive committee, to make a report to the Association on forms provided for that purpose." (I am sure this has not been in practice recently.)

"Each college in the Association is entitled to three representatives at all meetings, but the institution shall have but one vote."

[As to the officers] "The president and vice president are not to be from the same institution, and are to hold office for one year only. The secretary-treasurer is to hold office indefinitely or until the successor is elected."

In the by-laws we find that member schools shall be in two classes:

"A. Those institutions granting bachelor's degrees, and B. those normal colleges and junior colleges not granting degrees. Also, a degree-granting college shall not maintain a preparatory school as part of its college organization unless such preparatory school is kept rigidly distinct from the college in students, in faculty, and in discipline. Each member school is to pay ten dollars annually."

The purpose and spirit of the constitution have been adhered to through the years even though the executive committee has not recently requested the three-year report mentioned, and the policy of limiting the attendance to three representatives for each college has been reversed to the extent of hoping that as many as possible of the members of the various faculties will

be present at the meetings and at the luncheons which follow. At the last meeting, the president was authorized to appoint a committee to study the constitution and plan a revision.

The second meeting was held on Friday evening and Saturday morning, February 3 and 4, 1922, at Millsaps College. Although the minutes do not say so, the colleges represented here as members must have been the charter members. They were All Saints', Belhaven, Millsaps, Mississippi State College for Women; Grenada, Mississippi A. & M., State Normal, University of Mississippi, Mississippi College, and Hillman. Listed as visitors are: President Cooper of Synodical College, President L. T. Lowrey of Blue Mountain College, President Carter of Clarke Memorial, and Dr. H. M. Ivy of the State Department of Education. A letter on file from Dr. Lowrey, dated November 23, 1923, to Miss Nellie S. Kearn, who was then secretary, states that he plans to apply for membership at the next meeting as he had been able to make the separation between the college and the preparatory departments. He says, "I did not care to be classed with the junior colleges and hence deferred my application until I could meet the conditions of the constitution as to class A colleges."

The third recorded meeting was in December, 1922. The report of that meeting is sketchy because, as is stated in several letters on file, Mr. J. I. Johnson, who acted as secretary, put the minutes in his traveling bag which was afterward stolen, minutes and all. He writes, "While I regret the loss of the traveling bag, such regret is as nothing compared with my feeling upon losing the minutes. I hope that you and the members of the Association will understand the circumstances of this loss. It does seem to me that any thief would have left the minutes behind him when he took the bag." He adds: "The only really important action of the Association was the appointment of a committee to pass upon the junior colleges. The chairman of this committee was Dr. Latimer of Mississippi College."

As to the record of later meetings we quote with slight modification some significant paragraphs from the minutes and from letters concerning plans for the meetings.

April 28, 1927.—"The regular program was carried out, nineteen of the twenty-one who were placed on the program responding with talks on the topics for which they were scheduled. The Association convened at 9:00 A.M. and was in session until 5:20 P.M. with the exception of the noon hour for lunch. Forty-three were present, the larger part of whom attended for the entire day."

April 17, 1930.—"Due to the fact that only one college had paid its dues during the year, the Association agreed that bills should be sent out by the treasurer."

We now send out the bills in October and again in February to those who need the second notice. In recent years mimeographed copies of the list of paid and unpaid members are given out to those present at the annual meetings. Usually the number of unpaid members does not exceed two. In 1942 every member paid. At the last meeting, the budget committee recommended that back dues should be paid if a college is to retain its membership.

After a time the meetings were called in the spring each year, at some hotel, and were finally set to meet on Thursday during the Mississippi Education Association Convention. Since 1929 there has been a luncheon in connection with the meeting.

In regard to the programs there are many interesting letters with suggested plans. Among these is the note, "Perhaps there should be some topic of special interest to the women's colleges; such as, Whitworth, Belhaven, Grenada, the Synodical, and All Saints'." Other suggested topics were:

- "College credit for First Year Latin;
- "Limitation of enrollment;
- "Limitation of women students;
- "Elimination of the unfit; and
- "Plans for physical education and athletics in women's colleges."

A few topics from the programs through the years will show that the programs have been built around practical problems of the day. The topics quoted are listed in chronological order:

- "How can colleges improve the preparation of pupils in high schools?"
- "To what extent should work in commercial branches, music, art, and expression be recognized for college admission?"
- "Should required entrance subjects include ancient and modern languages?"
- "How can we secure desirable uniformity in passing standards in all college courses?"
- "How can the Mississippi Association of Colleges be more helpful to member colleges?"
- "Contribution of the Church school;
- "Self-help and student loans;
- "In what ways are high school graduates deficient?"
- "In what ways are college graduates deficient?"
- "In what ways do college graduates excel?"
- "Social life in the colleges;
- "Why not restrict boys as well as girls in reference to study hours and the like?"
- "Why the University should not be moved to Jackson;

- "Eliminate or salvage the difficult student?"
- "Forestalling vandalism;
- "The weekend exodus;
- "Personnel work in the colleges;
- "College education and life;
- "Guidance in living;
- "Vocational training through life situations;
- "The college professor comes to life;
- "Improvement of college instruction;
- "Report on transfer students;
- "The students' part in financing higher education."

From 1933 to 1941, the programs consisted largely of reports of the English Commission, the Junior College Commission, and of the progress of the individual colleges, with guest speakers of importance whose names and subjects are listed in the next paragraph below. Since 1941, the themes have been connected with "The Emergency," "Plans for Defense," "The War," and "What to do for the Veterans."

Special guest speakers and their subjects since 1931 when Dr. McGoffin spoke as President of the American Classical League, have been as follows:

- 1932—Dr. Doak S. Campbell, now President of the Florida College for Women, "The Future Curriculum of the College for Women."
- 1933—Dr. Ben D. Wood, Director of the Coöperative Test Service of the American Council on Education, "Responsibility of the College for Guidance."
- 1934—Dr. Belmont Farley, Division of Publications of the National Education Association, "The College and the Public."
- 1935—Dr. Edward S. Evenden, Columbia University, "The Liberal Arts College and the Education of Teachers."
- 1936—Dr. Willard Givens, Executive Secretary of the National Education Association, "Science, Democracy, and Education."
- 1937—Dr. McBryde, Tulane, "What Do Our Colleges Need Most?"
- 1938—Dr. R. E. Tidwell, Director of Extension at the University of Alabama, "A Major Function of the College in the Education of a Free People."
- 1939—Dr. Edwin Mims, Vanderbilt (Minutes missing).
- 1940—Dr. W. C. Eels, Secretary of the Junior College Association, "The Junior College, a Substitute or a Supplement?"
Dr. F. P. Gaines, President of Washington and Lee University, "Continuity and Change on the Campus."
- 1941—Dr. Mark McClosky, Member of the Federal Security Agency, "What Can the College Do in the National Emergency?"

- 1942—Dr. Edwin Mims, Vanderbilt, "Freedom to Learn as Well as to Shoot."
 Dr. Roscoe E. Parker, Coördinating Secretary of the Committee on Work Conferences, "Report of the Conference on Higher Education at Sewanee, Tenn."
- 1943—Dr. Phillip G. Davidson, Dean of the Graduate School, Vanderbilt, "Education for a Changing World and the Evaluation of College Instruction."
- 1944—Dr. Paul Irvine, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, "Colleges in the Reconstruction and Making Use of Our Resources."

A bright thread running through the records is the story of the junior colleges. It begins with the appointment in 1922 of a committee to pass upon the junior colleges, a committee which is later referred to as the Junior College Commission.

Topics on the programs from year to year show the trend and progress of the Junior Colleges:

- 1923—"The percentage of junior college graduates in the senior colleges."
- 1925—"Coördination of work of junior and senior colleges."
- 1926—"Uniform courses in the first two years of college."
- 1928—"Relations that should exist between the junior colleges and the senior colleges."
- 1932—"Increased enrollment in junior colleges reported."
- 1935—"Junior College Commission now allows graduates of junior college fifty per cent of the hours required for graduation at the institutions they enter after graduation."
- 1936—"Report on the junior college and senior college compared as to holding power and a comparison of senior college students and those transferred from junior colleges. (Very little difference is seen.)"
- 1940—"It is reported that eighteen junior colleges in the State are meeting standards, one has received warning, and one was put on probation."
- 1942—"The Junior College Commission reports that eight junior colleges are approved by Southern Association and eight by Mississippi Junior College Accrediting Association and one to be evaluated as credits are transferred."
- 1943—"Mr. Broom reports on the work and publications of the Mississippi Junior College laboratory held at Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee."

Extracts from letters on file *also* show the change in attitude toward the junior colleges and their changes in standards and value.

1922.—“The senior colleges are facing a situation that is likely to be serious—I expect to see the junior colleges marching en masse on the Legislature and on the basis of numbers, demand an appropriation sufficient to take care of the present numbers; and one dare not prophesy where they will stop.”

“There is no better topic for discussion than what recognition the colleges will give to the work done in the freshman and sophomore classes in the high schools—that is, the so-called junior colleges.”

From another college president:

“I take it that there should be some deliberation on the question of standards for junior colleges which the Association shall set up as a prerequisite for recognizing credits from those institutions. It seems to me that some such action should be taken at once. . . . Certainly none of the class A colleges can afford to recognize work which has been done under substantially weaker conditions than obtain within its own walls. . . .

“I have had some experience already this fall in handling the problem of allowing credit and advanced standing to students coming from this type of school. In each case the applicant has been unable to maintain himself in the advanced course. Each has declined to take an examination on the work for which he asked credit, and in one case he has voluntarily suggested that he should do the work over in our class under standard college conditions. . . .”

May 7, 1924.—(A speaker reported that in 1922 there were ninety-one junior colleges and over two hundred in 1924; thirty-six out of forty-eight states had established junior colleges; there were six then in Mississippi, with two agricultural high schools giving junior college work. The speaker opposed the making of agricultural high schools into junior colleges. In his opinion there was need for no more junior or senior colleges here. The speaker recommended that each denomination have one senior college and make junior colleges out of the other denominational colleges then existing.)

(A spokesman for the junior colleges said that especially those which were outgrowths of the agricultural high schools could carry education to the people.)

1934.—“Unfortunately, in our State there can be nothing but competition and war till at least half the colleges are dead. As a business proposition, the State could well afford to swap all its junior colleges

for a few first class high schools, or for some rural schools efficient in teaching the 'three R's'."

On the other side of the question we find:

1921.—"It seems to me that the question of vital importance is that of establishment of junior colleges throughout the State. I am very much in favor of the establishment of these junior colleges under the proper restrictions: first, to relieve the congestion in the first two years in our state institutions, and perhaps more important than this, to carry higher education nearer to the people. It is only a question of time before every state will have junior colleges dotting it just as the agricultural high schools are to be found in every section of our State. . . . We have an ideal opportunity to convert these agricultural high schools into junior colleges. Of course, it will take time to do this. Naturally there will be opposition to such a plan just as there was when we discussed the abolishment of preparatory departments in the University and other colleges."

1934.—"I see no reason why there should not be a very cordial relationship existing between the senior and junior colleges in Mississippi. The mission of the junior colleges is entirely separate and distinct from the mission of the senior colleges. Its major objective is to serve students who will never go to senior college."

"I think the relationship of the junior college and the senior college that have a considerable stream of young people passing from one to the other should be far closer than is now the case."

"Junior colleges are more definitely responsible to the local area than the lower division of the senior colleges."

In 1943, Dr. Harrell reported for the Junior College Commission that he and Dr. Shaw were the only members who had been with it from the beginning. At first the commission consisted of five members, all from the senior colleges. Later, representatives from the junior colleges were added. There are now sixteen junior colleges recognized by the commission: twelve public, four private or denominational. The first four to be inspected were Gulf Park, Hillman, Hinds, and Pearl River. The total revenue for public supported junior colleges per year is now \$809,000—24 per cent of this from tuition, 52 per cent from local taxes, 17 per cent from the State, and 7 per cent from miscellaneous sources. The faculties are reported up to standard. The junior colleges are meeting the situation well.

Dr. Harrell also reported that the General Education Board had made a grant of \$7,500 for three years to the junior colleges of Mississippi for a study of how they may better serve their communities. This money is being used by several of the colleges on projects approved by the General Education

Board. Jones County Junior College serves seven counties. A study of the needs of this area brought about developments in student counseling and guidance, religious leadership training, forestry, vocational-technical training units, sweet potato machinery development, food preservation and production, and general interest in the development of rural life. East Central Junior College has made a study of rural life in its vicinity and held a three-day rural life conference. Possibly as a result of this, Governor Bailey later called a state-wide rural life conference in Jackson. Hinds Junior College is surveying Hinds County first as to surveys already made, as to its own facilities, and as to the churches in the county and their activities. It has also sent representatives to conferences in Louisiana and Texas. Other junior colleges have participated in the General Education Board study.

The members of the present Junior College Commission are Mr. C. L. Harrell, Millsaps; Dr. C. A. Shaw, University of Mississippi; Dr. W. H. Sumrall, Mississippi College; Dr. G. T. Buckley, Mississippi State College for Women; Dr. W. M. Kethley, Delta State Teachers College; Dr. J. B. George, Mississippi Southern College; Dr. L. O. Todd, East Central Junior College; and Mr. G. M. McLendon, Hinds Junior College.

Other commissions of the Mississippi Association of Colleges are the English Commission, the Committee on Improvement of Instruction, and the Committee on Personnel Work.

The English Commission has done a great deal of work toward raising the standard of the teaching of English composition; it has studied the practices of the colleges in their sophomore courses in English literature. It has held several meetings in recent years with well-planned programs including talks by both college and high school teachers and guest speakers of note, among whom are Dr. Roger P. McCutcheon of Tulane, and Dr. J. C. Hodges and Dr. Roscoe Parker, both of the University of Tennessee. Persons largely responsible for this work are Dr. Daugherty, Dr. R. G. Lowrey, and Dr. Milton White.

The Committee on the Improvement of Instruction published in pamphlet form the report of its work. Mr. G. J. Gain was chairman of this commission.

The Committee on Personnel Work offered many suggestions as to efficient methods of dealing with personnel problems. Credit for this work seems largely due to Mrs. Frances P. Mills. The committee ceased to function in 1933.

Many other commissions or committees have been given special responsibilities, but to report on them all would take more time and space than we have been allotted.

Presidents of the Association have been Dr. J. C. Fant, Mississippi State College for Women; Dr. J. W. Provine, Mississippi College; Dr. J. R. Count-

iss, Grenada College; Dr. M. P. L. Berry, Hillman; Dr. L. T. Lowrey, Blue Mountain; Dr. G. L. Harrell, Millsaps; Dr. F. J. Weddell, Agricultural and Mechanical College; Dr. L. Q. Campbell, Mississippi Woman's College; Dr. A. W. Milden, University of Mississippi; Dr. R. F. Cooper, Mississippi Synodical; Dr. D. M. Nelson, Mississippi College; Dr. W. H. Weathersby, State Teachers College; Dr. Clytee Evans, Mississippi State College for Women; Mr. G. J. Cain, Hinds Junior College; Dr. A. B. Butts, University of Mississippi; Dr. B. L. Parkinson, Mississippi State College for Women; Mr. James Ewing, Copiah-Lincoln Junior College; Dr. G. D. Humphrey, Mississippi State College; Mr. J. B. Young, Jones County Junior College; Dr. W. H. Sumrall, Mississippi College; Dr. L. O. Todd, East Central Junior College; and Dr. M. L. Smith, Millsaps College.

The vice president has customarily become the next president. The following have served as secretary-treasurers: Dean Bowen, Agricultural and Mechanical College; Miss Nellie Kearn, Mississippi State College for Women; Mrs. B. K. Daugherty, Mississippi State College for Women; Mrs. Frances Preston Mills, Belhaven; Miss Janet McDonald, Hinds Junior College; and Miss Ruth Boyd, Hinds Junior College.

The present roster of members of the Association with the names of the presidents and the locations of the schools is as follows:

Rev. W. G. Christian, All Saints' College, Vicksburg
 Dr. W. C. Gillespie, Belhaven College, Jackson
 Dr. L. T. Lowrey, Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain
 Dr. William Earl Greene, Clark Memorial College, Newton
 Mr. W. H. Smith, Copiah-Lincoln Junior College, Wesson
 Dr. W. M. Kethley, Delta State Teachers College, Cleveland
 Dr. L. O. Todd, East Central Junior College, Decatur
 Mr. J. M. Tubb, East Mississippi Junior College, Scooba
 Dr. Richard G. Cox, Gulf Park Junior College, Gulfport
 Mr. A. L. May, Harrison-Stone-Jackson Junior College, Perkinston
 Mr. C. M. McLendon, Hinds Junior College, Raymond
 Mr. R. M. Branch, Holmes Junior College, Goodman
 Mr. J. B. Young, Jones County Junior College, Ellisville
 Dr. H. M. Ivy, Meridian Junior College, Meridian
 Dr. M. L. Smith, Millsaps College, Jackson
 Dr. D. M. Nelson, Mississippi College, Clinton
 Dr. J. B. George, Mississippi Southern College, Hattiesburg
 Dr. G. D. Humphrey, Mississippi State College, State College
 Dr. B. L. Parkinson, Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus
 Mr. R. C. Pugh, Northwest Junior College, Senatobia
 Mr. R. D. McLendon, Pearl River Junior College, Poplarville
 Mr. J. M. Kenna, Southwest Mississippi Junior College, Summit

Mr. W. B. Horton, Sunflower Junior College, Moorhead
 Dr. A. B. Butts, University of Mississippi, Oxford
 Mr. Sinclair Daniel, Whitworth College, Brookhaven
 Dr. Walter L. Russell, Wood Junior College, Mathison

In conclusion, it seems that the extent to which the Association has achieved its purposes as stated in its constitution, "to promote good will, fellowship among the colleges of Mississippi, to improve their standards, and develop uniform practices," is perhaps well expressed in a recorded statement concerning one of the programs: "I am delighted with the program of our April meeting. It seems to me to be a cross section of the fundamental problems which confront workers in the college field today, and the speakers are persons with a message from real experience." The degree of friendly coöperation among our colleges has frequently been commented on by representative persons from other states as being outstanding.

The Louisiana College Conference: A Brief History

BY H. L. GRIFFIN

Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, Southwestern Louisiana Institute

Prior to 1938, the only occasion that brought college administrators and teachers of Louisiana together regularly was the annual convention of the Louisiana Teachers Association, normally held in November. This convention was usually attended by several thousand teachers, and its deliberations were conducted in general meetings and through the medium of a score or more of sections or specialized groups, each with its own officers and program. One of these numerous sections was the College Section, kept alive by the attendance of a few brave and faithful ones determined to keep it going in spite of the highly competitive conditions under which it had to operate.

The meeting of the College Section was confined to one morning session lasting from nine o'clock until twelve noon. This session was normally devoted to the reading of two or three formal papers, a brief discussion of them, and the election of a chairman and a secretary for the ensuing year. It is true that at times the papers were excellent and the discussions most stimulating, but the program frequently had to be delayed or rushed through because participants had to attend or speak before some other section of the convention. Frequently one who had read a paper could not stay to hear his own paper discussed. Sometimes so many members of the section had to leave that by the end of the program there were scarcely enough members remaining to elect officers for the next year. The result was that there was little time or opportunity for college teachers to discuss many of the pressing problems that were facing the colleges of Louisiana. Such were the conditions when the College Section in 1933 elected as its president for the ensuing year Dean John A. Hardin of Centenary College.

Soon after his election to the headship of the College Section, Dean Hardin wrote to Dean Harry Lewis Griffin, of Southwestern Louisiana Institute, stating his concern over the status of the College Section and asking for suggestions as to how it might be improved and its influence expanded. In his reply Dean Griffin expressed the opinion that the colleges of the state could probably never accomplish a great deal collectively as long as their only medium of activity was confined to one brief annual meeting as a section of a public school teachers' association. The meeting period was too brief, and the distractions were too numerous. Dean Griffin then stated in his letter that the colleges should organize their own association and such

project would be a good one for Dean Hardin to promote during his term of office.

Dean Hardin agreed with the suggestion and wrote to the college associations of a number of southern states, including Texas, Mississippi, and Tennessee, for copies of their constitutions and programs. These copies he left in the files of the College Section when he retired from office, and they were passed on to his successor—who happened to be Dean Griffin—without any official action having been taken. During the following year the matter of forming a college association in Louisiana was discussed with a number of college men in the state and much sentiment found in its favor. Letters were written to the presidents of all colleges and universities in Louisiana asking if their institutions would be willing to join and support such an organization. With only one exception all of them wrote an affirmative reply.

At the next meeting of the College Section, held at the Bolton High School in Alexandria, on November 22, 1935, President E. L. Stephens of Southwestern Louisiana Institute moved, in the business meeting of the section, that Chairman Griffin be authorized to appoint a committee to draw up a plan for an organization of all Louisiana colleges. This motion was seconded by Dean C. A. Ives of Louisiana State University and passed without opposition. A committee of three was appointed with Dean C. A. Ives as chairman. At the conclusion of this meeting the same officers were re-elected to serve another year in order that they might keep alive the idea of a college association.

The Louisiana Teachers Association held its next convention in Monroe, on November 19, 20, and 21, 1936. The meeting of the College Section was held on November 20, in the auditorium of the Northeast Center of Louisiana State University. The attendance at this session was very small, though the program was most excellent. The general theme for discussion was "The College Testing Program," and four splendid papers were read and fully discussed. They were as follows: "Minimum Essentials of a Testing Program," by Mr. J. O. Pettis of Louisiana State University; "Testing for Placement," by Dr. Stuart G. Noble of Tulane University; "Testing for Special Aptitudes," by Mr. Charles B. Flack of Southwestern Louisiana Institute; and "The Comprehensive Examination," by Dr. J. T. Hooker of Louisiana State Normal College. The inability of so many college representatives to be present to hear and discuss these significant papers was, to those who were present, a convincing reason why the colleges should form an association of their own.

In the business meeting that followed the program, Dean C. A. Ives, chairman of the committee appointed to prepare a plan for a Louisiana college association, presented a brief tentative report, accompanied by a suggested plan of organization, if such an association were to be formed. In making the report, however, Dean Ives suggested that no final action

on it be taken because of the small number of colleges represented at the meeting. At his suggestion, therefore, the report was placed on file and the committee continued for another year, with the distinct understanding that a final report would be presented at the next meeting of the section and an attempt made to reach a decision on the proposed organization. The officers elected for the ensuing year were President Claybrook Cottingham of Louisiana College, chairman, and Dr. Herbert L. Hughes of Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, secretary.

During the following year there was considerable discussion of the proposed association among college representatives whenever they met. Many were troubled at the thought of breaking away from the teachers' association with which they had been so long associated. Various solutions to this difficulty were proposed. Some thought the two might meet at the same time and place, or continue to meet with the teachers' association in the fall and then meet independently in the spring. Others thought that the separation should be complete, thus permitting those who so desired, to attend both. At any rate, at the next meeting of the College Section, held at Dodd College in Shreveport, at ten o'clock in the morning on November 19, 1937, there was a good attendance of college representatives and interest was high. Among the many excellent papers at this meeting was one by Thomas E. Ferguson, Dean of Stephen F. Austin State Teachers College of Texas, and Secretary-Treasurer of the Association of Texas Colleges, on the "Advantages of a State Association of Colleges."

The paper of Dean Ferguson and the discussion that followed made such a deep impression that in the ensuing business session the group plunged immediately into a consideration of the proposed college association. Dr. Herbert L. Hughes moved that such an association be formed. This motion was seconded and carried unanimously. Dean C. A. Ives was then called upon to present, as the report of his committee, the tentative constitution which had been filed the previous year, with such changes as his committee had agreed upon. This he did with only two minor changes in the new draft: the first eliminated a provision for individual memberships, and the other inserted "annually" in the provision for the election of executive committee members. A motion to adopt the constitution with the two amendments was made by the late Dr. E. L. Stephens, then president of Southwestern Louisiana Institute, and after a brief discussion was unanimously carried. Present and voting for this constitution were representatives from the following institutions: Dodd College, Centenary College, Loyola University, Louisiana State University, Tulane University, Louisiana State Normal College, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Southeastern Louisiana College, Newcomb College, and Northeast Center of Louisiana State University. The chairman, Dr. Claybrook Cottingham, represented Louisiana College.

Having adopted a constitution, the College representatives proceeded to elect officers for the next year. Those chosen were Dr. C. A. Ives, of Louisiana State University, president; Dr. S. G. Noble, of Tulane University, vice president; Dr. Herbert L. Hughes, of Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, secretary-treasurer; and Dr. Claybrook Cottingham, of Louisiana College, and Dr. M. P. Rogers, of Louisiana State Normal College, members of the executive committee.

The constitution as adopted was—and still is—a very brief instrument, consisting of a single typewritten page. It provided that the name of the new association should be the Louisiana College Conference. Its object, simply stated, is the advancement of higher education in Louisiana. Members are of two classes: colleges and universities, and junior colleges. The officers are a president, a vice president, and a secretary-treasurer, elected at the annual meeting. These three officers, together with two other persons elected annually, constitute the executive committee. Meetings of the Conference are held annually at a time and place to be determined by the executive committee. This committee also recommends to the Conference the amount of the fee to be paid by member colleges, and proposed amendments to the constitution.

The constitution provided originally that, in the transaction of business, each member college should have only one vote, but that faculty and staff of member institutions might enjoy the privilege of the floor in all discussions and of serving on committees. This provision later gave rise to considerable dissatisfaction due to the fact that this vote was presumably to be cast by the college president or his representative, thus depriving the college faculties of any effective participation in the determination and control of the work and policies of the organization. Dissatisfaction with this provision was first expressed at the March meeting in 1939. At this time a motion by Father Whelan, of Loyola University, requesting the executive committee to consider the advisability of amending the voting provisions of the constitution, was passed. This committee, in its report to the next meeting, held November 21, 1939, recommended that no change be made. Thus the matter stood until the meeting in March 1940 when the issue was again raised in the business session. After much spirited discussion, Dr. Marten Hoor, of Tulane University, moved that the matter be referred to the executive committee for careful consideration, in view of the fact that the question had been raised for a second time. Acting on this direction, the executive committee, meeting in Alexandria on April 27, 1940, recommended for adoption by the Conference at its next meeting the following amendment to Article Four of the Constitution: "For voting purposes, each member institution shall be entitled to three representatives, consisting of the president or his appointee and two others to be selected by the faculty."

This amendment was adopted by the Conference at its next meeting held in Monroe, November 19, 1940.

The adoption of this amendment, admitting representatives of the college faculties to a real share in the determination of Conference policies and programs, had a most salutary effect. In the first place, it disposed of the fear that the Conference might deteriorate into a mere organization of colleges serving their corporate interests only, to the neglect of the interests of the faculties involved. At any rate, faculty and staff members of the colleges began to take a renewed interest in the organization and sought to attend its sessions in ever increasing numbers. They began to feel that there was one college organization in the state where they could participate freely in the discussion of such vital college issues as "The Improvement of Teaching," "Curricular Reorganization," and "Preparation of College Students" on terms of equality with college presidents and deans. The new provision was a definite improvement over the original one and clarified beyond doubt the position of faculty and staff members in the activities of the Conference.

As has been mentioned, the object or purpose of the Conference was stated in the constitution to be "the advancement of higher education in Louisiana." The general nature of this statement made it inevitable that there should be proposals to set up standards of admission to be met by applicants for membership, thus converting the Conference into an accrediting agency for Louisiana. It was the consensus of opinion among college representatives that such an undertaking would not be an appropriate one. To clear up any doubts on this issue, two amendments have been adopted. To Article II, which states the object, has been added this statement: "This, however, shall not include the setting up of any kind of uniform standards or any type of accrediting of the institutions of higher learning in Louisiana." To Article II, Section 1, which sets up the classes of members, has been appended this sentence: "A condition of membership shall be that they have been duly accredited by the State Department of Education." Thus amended, the constitution now makes it clear that the Louisiana College Conference is intended to be an out and out professional organization devoted to the advancement of higher education in Louisiana, not through political or accrediting activities, but through meetings and programs in which presidents, deans, and teachers sit down together and discuss, on terms of equality, their problems, their researches, their plans, their hopes, and their fears with respect to the advancement of higher education in Louisiana.

The planning agency of the Conference is the executive committee. It now consists of the president, vice president, the secretary-treasurer, the retiring president, and two others elected annually by the Conference at its spring meeting, except that the secretary-treasurer shall continue to be a member of the executive committee for one year after his term of office

expires, for which year only one person shall be elected by the Conference to membership on the committee. This committee normally meets in November each year to plan the general outlines of the program, to select a general theme for the meeting, to fix the exact time and place of the annual meeting, and to choose an outstanding speaker for the banquet meeting. It also recommends for adoption by the Conference amendments to the constitution, by-laws, and the number of sections into which the Conference meeting shall be divided. Another important function is to recommend the annual fee to be paid by member colleges. The membership fee was first fixed at ten dollars at the 1939 meeting. It remained at this figure until November 1940, when it was increased to fifteen dollars. In this connection, it might be pointed out that this committee authorizes the expenditure of Conference funds.

Fearing to break away from the Louisiana Teachers Association too abruptly, the executive committee fixed the first meeting to coincide with the time and place of the Teachers Association, namely November 18, 1938, at Louisiana State University. The program was very brief, consisting of a symposium on this general theme: "What has the public a right to expect of the college graduate?" The meeting started about nine-thirty in the morning, and both program and business session had been completed by eleven-thirty o'clock. The attendance was quite small due to diversions offered by the activities of the Teachers Association. Because of the small attendance and the brief nature of the program, there was some disappointment at the showing made by the Conference at its first meeting. To remedy this situation, the Conference, by resolution passed in the business meeting, directed the executive committee to set a time for the next meeting that would not conflict with the meetings of the Louisiana Teachers Association.

Acting on the directions given at the Baton Rouge meeting, the executive committee set the next meeting date for Friday and Saturday, March 24 and 25, 1939, and the place at Louisiana College, Pineville. It was at this meeting that there was designed the pattern for future meetings of the Conference. The first session was a general meeting held Friday evening, March 24. Saturday morning, March 25, was given over to sixteen sectional meetings, each with its own program. At the end of the program, each section elected its chairman and secretary for the next year, and appointed committees to carry on any special assignments the section might desire to undertake. After a general business session held at one-thirty that afternoon, at which officers for the next year were selected, the Conference adjourned. The sections organized at this meeting were Agriculture, Alumni Secretaries, Business Managers, Classics, Commerce, Deans of Men and Deans of Women, Education, English, Fine Arts, Foreign Languages, Home Economics, Mathematics, Natural Sciences, Registrars, Social Sciences, Speech. While a few of these sections have become inactive, others such

as Psychology and a Presidents' Section, have been added, so that the number remains about the same. Approximately three hundred in all attended the sessions of this first separate meeting of the Conference.

The time for the annual meeting of the Conference has now been rather definitely established as March, though the Conference has held occasionally a brief morning program meeting during the annual sessions of the state teachers association. No such meeting, however, has been held since the Monroe meeting, held November 19, 1940. This meeting was held jointly with the High School Principals' Section of the Louisiana Teachers' Association. Its purpose was to give the membership of these two organizations a chance to discuss ways and means of "Closing the Gap between High School and College." After several twenty-minute papers dealing with the principles underlying this problem, the program was ended with a debate on the question, "Should the State Board of Education Require a Minimum Guidance Program in all High Schools?" The interest aroused by the discussions was so great that, shortly thereafter, the State Department of Education added to its staff a full-time director of guidance to work with the schools of the state on this important problem.

Beginning with the meeting of the Conference held at Loyola University in New Orleans, in March 1941, the general session usually held on Friday evening was transformed into a banquet meeting with a speaker of outstanding competence. The speaker on this occasion was Dr. A. P. Brogan, dean of the graduate school of the University of Texas, who spoke on the subject, "The Training of College Teachers." This same plan was followed at the banquet held at Southwestern Louisiana Institute on March 13, 1942, when the banquet guests were addressed by Dr. William F. Ogburn, Head of the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago. He spoke on the subject, "The Future of Education in America." At Louisiana State University, in 1942, the members attending the banquet had the pleasure of hearing Dr. Alexander Loudon, Ambassador of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United States, discuss "Some Thoughts on Postwar Reconstruction."

While the banquet and general sessions of the Conference have afforded all delegates a fine opportunity to get together and to hear discussed some of the major issues of college education, it is in the sectional or departmental meetings that representatives from member faculties have a chance to hear and participate in discussions of those subjects that are nearest to their hearts. In his section a business manager can learn how other colleges manage their loan funds, or finance their athletic programs; a dean of women can get some pointers on the supervision of sororities; or a professor of English may air his views on the inadequacy of high school instruction in English. Even the college presidents have admitted that, in their section, they have learned

know each other better and to acquire a more wholesome respect for and appreciation of the institutions represented by their fellow members. Some of these sections, in their programs and studies, have made genuine contributions to the cause of education. Included in this number are the English, mathematics, commerce, science, and foreign language sections, which have constantly, for several years, agitated the question of more thorough training of high school teachers in the subject matter of their respective fields. This agitation, supported by demands from other quarters, finally led in 1940 to the organization of a state committee charged with formulating recommendations to the State Board of Education for a revision of the requirements for the certification of teachers in Louisiana. These recommendations were submitted to the State Board in 1943 and, with minor modifications, adopted by it. As a result, applicants for teachers' certificates, beginning in 1947 will have to present evidence, not only of a broader preparation in general education, but also a more thorough mastery of the subject matter fields in which they plan to teach.

While the Louisiana College Conference is not old enough to have undertaken and carried to conclusion any long-range projects or researches, it has taken an active interest and part in current projects. In the Academic Deans' Section, in 1941, was made a progress report on the Work Conference on Higher Education of the Southern Association of Colleges. At the Baton Rouge meeting, in 1942, Dean Wendell Stephenson, in a general session, made a fuller report and evaluation of the accomplishments of this Work Conference. Though the College Conference held no spring meeting in 1944, its executive committee has been working with the postwar planning committee of the Southern Association of Colleges, which is headed in Louisiana by Dean Fred C. Frey, of Louisiana State University.

No account of an organization such as the Louisiana College Conference could be complete without some reference to the men who have led it and inspired its activities from year to year. In this respect the Conference has been most fortunate in the possession of able leaders as presidents. While there is no restriction as to who may be president, it is interesting to note that, in its brief history, the Conference has been headed by no college president; all have been college deans. There is every reason to believe that, in the near future, the Conference may likely go into the ranks of the promoters in the selection of its president; and this is as it should be in a professional organization of this kind. The list of officers who have served the Conference is given below, with the dates of their election to office:

November, 1937—President, Dr. C. A. Ives, Dean of the College of Education of Louisiana State University; Vice President, Dr. S. G. Noble, of Tulane University; Secretary-Treasurer, Dr. Herbert L. Hughes, of Louisiana Polytechnic Institute.

November, 1938—President, Dr. G. W. Bond, Dean of Southeastern Louisiana College; Vice President, Father James F. Whelan, Dean of Loyola University; Secretary-Treasurer, Dr. Herbert L. Hughes, of Louisiana Polytechnic Institute.

March, 1940—President, Dr. Herbert L. Hughes, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute; Vice President, Dr. Claybrook Cottingham, President of Louisiana College; Secretary-Treasurer, Dr. Harry Lewis Griffin, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, Southwestern Louisiana Institute.

March, 1941—President, Dr. Harry Lewis Griffin, of Southwestern Louisiana Institute; Vice President, Dean Warren J. Barker, S.J., of Loyola University; Secretary-Treasurer, Dean C. C. Colvert, of Northeast Junior College.

March, 1942—President, Dean Warren J. Barker, of Loyola University; Vice President, Dr. Marten ten Hoor, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Tulane University; Secretary-Treasurer, Dr. Sarah L. C. Clapp, of Louisiana State Normal College.

March, 1943—President, Dean H. M. Weathersby, of Louisiana College; Vice President, Dean H. Allain St. Paul, of Loyola University; Secretary-Treasurer, Dr. Sarah L. C. Clapp, of Louisiana State Normal College.

November, 1944—President, Dean John A. Hardin, of Centenary College; Vice President, Dean Rodney Cline, of John McNeese Junior College; Secretary-Treasurer, Mr. Leo M. Favrot, Jr., Acting Head of the Department of Economics and Business Administration, Southwestern Louisiana Institute.

Actions of the Executive Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, July 22, 1945, Memphis, Tennessee

The Executive Committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools met at 10:00 a.m., July 22, 1945, at the Peabody Hotel, Memphis, Tennessee.

Dean M. C. Huntley, Executive Secretary of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, came before the Executive Committee and presented the following resolution from the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education:

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools wishes to express its deep regret at the departure of Dr. G. D. Humphrey from this region. Dr. Humphrey has rendered distinguished service to Education as President of Mississippi State College and as President of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The Commission predicts his continued success, and extends its congratulations and good wishes to Dr. Humphrey as he begins his work as President of the University of Wyoming.

Signed for the Commission,
RUFUS C. HARRIS, *Chairman.*

The resolution was received and ordered spread upon the minutes. Dean Huntley informed the Executive Committee that the Committee had been appointed by the Chairman of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education and approved by the President of the Association in November to investigate conditions at the University of Texas had met in Atlanta, Georgia, July 12 and 13, and had made its report on July 14 to the Council of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education. The Council, meeting on July 13 in Atlanta, Georgia, acting for the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, had unanimously adopted the report.

At the request of the Council on Institutions of Higher Education, Dean Huntley presented the report of the Council as follows:

REPORT ON THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Pursuant to the direction of the President of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the Chairman of the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education appointed on November 9, 1944, a committee

consisting of President Herman L. Donovan of the University of Kentucky, Chairman, Dean M. C. Huntley of the University of Alabama, President Theodore H. Jack of Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Dean W. W. Pierson of the University of North Carolina, and President Rufus C. Harris of Tulane University (Chairman of the Commission), *ex-officio*, to investigate conditions at the University of Texas involved in the dismissal of President Homer P. Rainey by the Regents of the University on November 1, 1944.

The preamble to the Standards (SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY, February 1944, p. 172) sets forth the attitude of the Association toward its individual members as follows: "The Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools was organized in 1895 for the purpose of improving the quality of work and the procedures to be followed in institutions belonging to it. The Association is composed of members who voluntarily join it and willingly accept its standards. It does not desire in the least to exercise authority over institutions which are not members, and it brings no pressure of any kind to have schools or colleges join its ranks. It wishes to have an attitude of inclusiveness so as to welcome those who wish to join and who are properly qualified, but it is insistent that institutions must meet its requirements in letter and in spirit before they are accepted and after they become members."

The Committee made an extended investigation during the week of January 21, 1945. This investigation involved interviews with the Governor of the State, the Regents and some former Regents of the University, former President Rainey, Vice President Burdine, Acting President Painter, several deans of the University, numerous members of the faculty, students, the Senate Investigating Committee, official representatives of the Ex-Students Association, some newspaper officials, and numerous private citizens. A detailed study of various and sundry documents bearing on the problem was also made by the Committee.

During the stay of the Committee on the campus of the University in Austin, it was informed of the controversy that had developed and took account of the divisions in public opinion. It found each side to believe that it was totally and exclusively right and the opposition totally wrong. Charges and counter-charges involved issues of motives, honesty, and integrity. It is difficult to form an objective judgment of the validity of such charges, and fortunately, it is not necessary for this Committee to form such judgment on them. The Committee did find from testimony on both sides that the Board of Regents had lost confidence in President Rainey, that President Rainey had lost confidence in the Board, and that the parting of the ways was inevitable.

"Sound education can be developed only when bias and prejudice have been eliminated in the relation between teachers and students, in the relation between administrators, teachers, and students, and in the relation

between Boards of Control, administrators, teachers, and students. It is fundamental of sound procedure, therefore, that these enemies of objective judgment and justice be eliminated from educational systems as factors determining actions taken." This is a statement adopted by the Southern Association, which has served as a guide to the Committee in its deliberations.

"The people through their duly elected representatives have the right to determine, within the frame work of constitutional guarantees, the policies of educational institutions which they support, whether they be independent, church-related, or state-supported; but there are certain well established principles by which sound educational procedure is guided. The Board of Trustees (or Regents) is the legislative body whose function it is to determine the broad policies of institutions. Though it may have the power, it has not the right to assume the duties of the administration in the employment or discharge of staff members against the recommendation of the administrative officers, just as the administrative officers have not the right to determine what students have passed or failed against the recommendation of the professor. When either the board of control or the administration of an institution undertakes to assume duties outside its proper sphere, as defined in the institution's charter, the soundness of the entire educational program is jeopardized." The membership of the Southern Association, of which the University of Texas is a member, subscribes to this statement of principle.

As a consequence of the occupation of the Regents in routine and minor details of university administration, and as a result of a legalistic interpretation of its own powers and responsibilities, the Regents have violated this principle. The Committee had testimony by way of explanation of this undue interference in the administration of the University to the effect that it was caused by lack of confidence in the president. However this may be—and considerable evidence in support of this explanation was submitted to the Committee, which was convincing to some members but not to others *—the outcome has been an exercise by the Regents of power properly belonging to the president and the faculty. The effect of this is contrary to the common practice and tradition in educational institutions of the first class in America.

The Southern Association's standard on tenure reads: "Tenure should be regarded for all professorial ranks as continuous after a tentative period has expired." For many years a tenure rule has been in operation in the University of Texas. Recently the Regents initiated a review of the tenure

* With reference to the passage "and considerable evidence in support of this explanation was submitted to the Committee, which was convincing to some but not to others," President Donovan holds that no evidence of a convincing character was submitted to justify a lack of confidence in the president by the Board. There were different shades of opinion among the other members but concurrence in the fact that substantial evidence in support of the explanation was submitted.

regulation. A new set of regulations on tenure was proposed and adopted. These new regulations differed from the old in three main particulars: (1) the base was broadened to include instructors and assistant professors; (2) the Board reserved the right to proceed *de novo*, if it desired, after a hearing, and the same right was given to a faculty member; and (3) the Board instead of the president appoints the hearing committee.

The new regulations were drafted by a committee composed of three Regents and three members of the faculty.

There is a difference of opinion within the faculty and in the public mind whether the new rules strengthen or weaken the tenure regulation. The chief significance in this controversy has to do with the last two changes in the rules of tenure.

The Committee feels that except in the case of Dean Spies, as Professor of Preventive Medicine and Public Health, there has been no technical violation of tenure in recent years. There was testimony as to threats against the tenure of certain members of the faculty. None of these threats and none of the motives introduced by individual members of the Regents resulted in action by the Regents in violation of tenure. This agitation of the issue and the threats have, the Committee is informed, caused an uncertainty as to tenure to be felt by some members of the faculty. However desirable the removal of this uncertainty would be in the interest of security and harmony, the Committee does not consider that tenure is a real factor in this controversy.

With reference to academic freedom and the freedom of teaching and research, the Southern Association in "Principle 1" (Proceedings, February, 1944, p. 170) has stated: "First of all, freedom to teach the truth as he sees it is the privilege and the responsibility of the teacher, without which there is no hope of sound education. This is the heart of education's guarantee for freedom and the guarantee against totalitarian threat to the democratic way of life. This does not preclude special arrangements between institutions and teachers, nor is this to be interpreted to mean that one has the right to be protected by this principle if he teaches the overthrow of the principle or the system out of which it springs." Principle 6 (*id.*, p. 171) state: "Freedom to investigate and to publish the results of research is fundamental to the promotion of higher learning and social progress. Institutions have no right to withhold or require the withholding of results of research carried out by staff members, except in rare cases of national emergency when findings may be deemed of value to enemies of the State. Spokesmen for totalitarian states have denied the validity of this principle, but it is basic to the democratic conception of education and learning."

In consequence of endorsement of these principles the Association adopted Standard Six (*id.*, p. 175) which reads in part: "There should be no un-

reasonable restrictions as to academic freedom, but the faculty should recognize a corresponding responsibility in the exercise of this privilege."

These principles of the freedom of teaching and research—and other statements of them to the same import—are so generally accepted in American universities that it is deemed unnecessary to do more than to say that the Committee accepts them as fundamental prerequisites to the existence of an institution of the first class. It is the sincere contention of Dr. Rainey and many of his supporters that academic freedom has been imperilled and violated. Still others think that, rather than positive and flagrant violations, there has been a certain hostility to the freedom of teaching and of inquiry, especially in the fields of the social sciences, amounting to intimidation and a denial of financial support to certain research projects tantamount to official condemnation of such projects. Lastly, there are those who believe that academic freedom is enjoyed by the faculty, and that this freedom is relatively safe in the institution.

The Committee feels that in certain actions and attitudes the Regents, severally and as a body, have acted unwisely. More especially the Committee feels that the procedure of the Regents in requiring the submission to it of proposals for grants-in-aid for research problems already approved by the proper body in the University, namely the president and the Research Council, is unsound and contrary to efficient and orderly university administration. Further, the reported criticisms of certain teachers by individual members of the Regents have caused concern on the part of some members of the faculty.

It is the judgment of the Committee that the principle of academic freedom is reasonably safeguarded in the University despite instances in which suspicion has been raised.* So long as there is any threat or suspicion of a threat to freedom of teaching or inquiry, basic in the concept of all the members of the Committee, the situation in the institution will be unhealthy, and should be rectified in both law and practice.

One of the instances of alleged violation of academic freedom which has been very widely publicized, and about which an expression of opinion by this Committee is deemed pertinent, is the refusal of reemployment to three instructors in economics. In the evidence received, these instructors were denied reemployment because they refused to sign any form of apology for a communication to the press involving an alleged act of discourtesy to certain participants in a mass meeting in Dallas. The hearings held by the Regents were concerned with these issues of discourtesy and apology, but several persons testifying before the Committee believed that these were not the real issues before the Regents. They asserted that the real objec-

* President Donovan does not subscribe to this expression of the Committee on academic freedom, believing that it is but a mild criticism, when in fact it is his conclusion that academic freedom has been flagrantly violated.

tions of the Board rested on the opinions of these instructors concerning the Fair Labor Standards Act. If the latter opinion be sound, the action of the Regents is a violation of academic freedom; if the reasons for action by the Board related in fact to the question of discourtesy, that action had no relation to academic freedom. The only issue before the Committee would then be the question as to whether or not the punishment was more severe than the offense justified. Rights of tenure were not involved.

CONCLUSION

The Committee is convinced that administrative conditions in the University of Texas have been highly objectionable and in flagrant contravention of commonly accepted academic principles and practices.

The Committee feels quite definitely that the Board of Regents, as constituted in the years immediately preceding Dr. Rainey's dismissal, bears a heavy weight of responsibility for the unsatisfactory conditions in the University.

Since the Board of Regents is a continuing body, even though its personnel has been changed in recent months, the Committee believes that great responsibility remains on the Board for the correction of these unsatisfactory conditions.

Since Dr. Rainey is no longer President of the University, there is no necessity for a complete appraisal of the measure of his responsibility for the conditions in the University which the Committee has condemned. The majority of the Committee, however, is convinced that Dr. Rainey's measure of responsibility is significant and large.†

RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends that the University of Texas be placed on probation until such time as the Association is assured of the full observance of its principles and standards.

It was moved that the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, through the Executive Committee, receive and approve the report presented by the Commission on Higher Institutions, and place the University of Texas on probation, effective as of this date, and continuing until such time as the Association is assured of the full observance of its principles and standards. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

Dr. Humphrey tendered his resignation as President of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, effective at the close of the

†This judgment of the Committee is not shared by President Donovan, who does not consider that the responsibility of the unfortunate conditions which exist at the University of Texas can be charged to Dr. Rainey. He reserves the right to submit to the Association at a later date a more extended statement of his views on this subject if it should appear desirable in the future consideration of this whole problem.

present meeting of the Executive Committee. Dr. Humphrey explained that this action was necessary since he had accepted the Presidency of a University outside of the Southern Association territory.

By unanimous vote the Executive Committee expressed its appreciation to Dr. Humphrey for his outstanding services to Southern Education, and for his years of leadership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. His resignation as President of the Association was accepted with regret and with best wishes for his continued success.

By unanimous vote Dr. W. J. McConnell was elected President of the Association to succeed Dr. Humphrey.

Dr. R. F. Poole, President of Clemson College, Clemson, South Carolina, was elected to fill the place on the Executive Committee formerly occupied by Dr. McConnell.

The Committee adjourned.

J. R. ROBINSON, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

Fifth Report of the Committee on Work Conferences on Higher Education

Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools
1944-1945

The Committee on Work Conferences on Higher Education has continued its work during 1944-45 according to plans developed in April, 1944. Foreseeing that circumstances might render meetings of the full Committee impossible, and that its plans might have to be changed because of changing conditions, the Committee authorized its Executive Committee to continue its work "until the next Work Conference." The Executive Committee has assumed this responsibility, has met as occasion demanded, and has submitted by mail to all the members of the Committee on Work Conferences its proposals for action. Every action taken in carrying forward the work which it was created to promote has therefore been the action of the Committee.

An interim report on the work of the Committee, accepted by the Executive Committee of the Association and by the sponsoring Commissions, was published in the SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY for May, 1945, pages 240-242. The Committee is now able to announce that the recommendations contained in that report have been approved by the General Education Board and that the unexpended balance in the grant for the work of the Committee has been continued until June 30, 1947. Since that report is available to all members of the Association, it is unnecessary to repeat here the summary statements contained therein.

As was stated in the report to the Executive Committee of the Association on March 7, 1945, the Committee has continued for 1944-45 the office of its Executive Secretary with a budget of \$2,650.00. The amount of the budget actually spent was \$2,158.11 plus \$6.45 (used for the purchase of postage stamps) received from the sale of the *Fourth Annual Report*, of which about six hundred copies were distributed gratis. The cost of publishing 1,000 copies of the *Fourth Report* of the Committee was \$17.85. The amount (\$6.45) received from sales and applied to office expenses reduced the cost to \$11.40. Total expenditure for the year, including receipts from the sale of the report, was therefore \$2,164.56. The unexpended balance of \$491.89 will be transferred to the contingent fund of "Budget C, Work Conferences."

In addition to the activities outlined in the May QUARTERLY, the Com-

mittee has issued ten numbers of its *Bulletin (Sixth Series)*. More than five hundred copies have been distributed each month. An effort has been made to keep coöperating institutions informed of work in progress and to furnish them with bibliographical materials which might prove helpful in carrying forward their own institutional studies. The Committee has been greatly assisted by the Division of Higher Education of the U. S. Office of Education in the preparation of current bibliographies.

In compliance with a number of requests, the Committee has published in the February, 1945, QUARTERLY,* under the title "College and Community," a report on the survey made last year of "programs already in progress or contemplated which aim to carry college instruction beyond the campus into the community." This report is an expansion of the summary contained in Section IV of the *Fourth Report* of the Committee.

The Committee wishes to devote the remainder of this report to three major activities which it deems of considerable importance to the future of education in the South and to which it has given much attention during the year. It will continue to give considerable attention to them during 1945-46.

The first of these is the continuation of the development of institutional studies in higher education. In addition to special studies which have been undertaken under the auspices of the Committee or at the special request of the Committee, forty-seven member institutions of the Association have reported a total of 142 committees engaged in the study of more than twenty problems in higher education. This compares favorably with the thirty-nine institutions that reported ninety-two working committees in 1943-44. Even more significant is the fact that this is the largest number of working committees reported since the creation of the Committee on Work Conferences. The largest number previously reported was 116 in 1942-43, and 105 institutions reported in that year. Certainly the institutions in the Southern Association are utilizing their own resources for the study of their own problems.

It is significant that thirty of these 142 committees are engaged in curriculum studies, twelve in planning for postwar education, ten in teacher education, nine in evaluation and examinations, and seven in guidance and personnel service. Others are engaged in the study of administrative boards of general colleges, social science, faculty, education, improvement of instruction, graduate council, pre-medical work, entrance and credits, freshman orientation, planning board, joint programs, general survey, library, aviation, and miscellaneous.

Every institution of higher education has, of course, a curriculum committee. Not every institution has all these committees listed above. And

* Pp. 80-89.

not every curriculum committee is giving serious and intensive study to its institutional curriculum. The thirty reported to the Committee are engaged in such study. This is also true of the other committees.

Since the problems with which these committees are engaged constitute basic problems in all higher education, the Committee believes that the work of these institutional committees will not only serve to vitalize education in each institution but that it will extend far beyond the individual institutions concerned and will have an important bearing upon the improvement of both secondary and higher education throughout the Association. Such indigenous study initiated by institutions concerned with the solution of their problems through the utilization of their own resources is probably the most significant recent development in higher education in the South. As the results of these studies are made available to all institutions through the report now in process of preparation (and described later in this report), every institution will profit from them and many will be moved to take stock and find ways and means of improving their own educational procedures. It may not be an exaggeration, therefore, to say that the entire South is in the midst of a renaissance in education which will vitally affect this and future generations. For this the Committee does not claim credit, but it is happy to be participating in it and to serve as the instrument for recording it.

A second significant activity in which the Committee has engaged grew out of a number of suggestions received last year and summarized in the *Fourth Report*. It was the suggestion of the need for "providing a reasonable plan for the improvement and evaluation of teaching." This suggestion was given careful consideration in a conference with representatives of the Southern Conference on Teacher Education and the Conference of Deans of Southern Graduate Schools.

After considerable exploration, the representatives agreed that the plan should be undertaken under the auspices of the Committee on Work Conferences on Higher Education and that a coöperative committee representing institutions and organizations concerned with the education of teachers should be organized to prepare a series of studies which might serve as a basis for discussion and action in the next general work conference. They further agreed that Professor Edgar W. Knight, Chairman of the Committee on Work Conferences on Higher Education, would serve as bibliographer for the proposed committee and that Professor Roscoe E. Parker, Executive Secretary of the Committee on Work Conferences on Higher Education, would serve as coördinator.

It was suggested that sub-committees for the study of problems in teacher education should include members from the various educational levels and institutional types.

Problems proposed for study (but not intended to exclude others) were the following:

I. A survey of needs for teachers in the South: number, type, kind of education, ways of improving instruction, etc.

II. A survey of curricula for the education of teachers on: A. The elementary school level, B. The high school level, C. The college level.

III. The coöperation of departments, schools, and organizations for the utilization of the total resources of institutions in the education of teachers: including provision for apprentice and practice teaching.

IV. The relation of liberal arts education to the education of teachers: A. Trend in emphasis on courses in professional education, B. Relation of arts courses to professional courses on the various levels.

V. The function of graduate schools of the South in the education of teachers: A. A study of methods of adjustment of teaching and work in graduate schools to the preparation and needs of teachers, B. A study of the proportion of teachers and prospective teachers to the total number of graduate students in the South, C. The place and kind of research in a graduate program for teachers, D. The value of a first graduate degree (A.M., M.S., M.ED.) on course work only (without a thesis), E. The control of graduate degrees by accreditation and by law, F. The education, apprenticeship, and certification or licensing (if required) of college teachers.

VI. The recruitment and selection of prospective teachers: A. Scholarship programs in colleges and graduate schools, B. Means of selecting competent people for scholarships and fellowships in colleges and graduate schools.

VII. The in-service education of teachers: A. By colleges and graduate schools, B. By extension work: opportunities, standards, and weaknesses.

VIII. An analysis of experiments and studies in methods of coöperative procedures in the education of teachers: characteristics, values, and ways of promotion.

The following groups and organizations are coöperating with the Committee on Work Conferences in the Coöperative Study of Teacher Education (Since a complete report on the Study will be published later, only the names of the participating organizations and the chairmen of the committees are given.):

Group	<i>Committee Chairman or Representative</i>
I. Conference of Academic Deans . . .	Dean J. J. Oppenheimer, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky

<i>Group</i>	<i>Committee Chairmen or Representative</i>
2. Conference of Deans of Southern Graduate Schools	Dean Philip Davidson, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee
3. Church-Related Colleges of the South	Professor W. C. Herbert, Wofford College, Spartanburg, South Carolina
4. Commission on Institutions of Higher Education	President E. M. Gwathmey, Converse College, Spartanburg, South Carolina
5. Committee on Southern Regional Studies and Education	Dr. John E. Ivey, Executive Secretary, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina
6. Heads of Departments and Deans of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges of the Southern States	Dean Kenneth Williams, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia
7. Humanities Study Conference, Vanderbilt University	Dr. E. H. Duncan, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee
8. Natural Science Study, University of Georgia	Dean George H. Boyd, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia
9. Social Science Study, University of North Carolina	Dr. Gordon Blackwell, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina
10. Southern Conference on Teacher Education	Dr. J. L. Blair Buck, Director of Teacher Training, State Board of Education, Richmond, Virginia
11. Southern States Work Conference on School Administrative Problems	Dr. R. E. Jagers, Kentucky State Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky

In addition to these organizations, the following institutions are also coöperating in the Study:

<i>Group</i>	<i>Committee Chairmen or Representative</i>
1. Alabama College	Dr. M. L. Orr, Head of Department of Education, Montevallo, Alabama
2. Alabama, University of	Professor Gladstone H. Yeuell, Head of Department of Secondary Education, University, Alabama
3. Kentucky, University of	Professor Carsie Hammond, College of Education, Lexington, Kentucky
4. North Carolina, University of	Professor A. K. King, Division of Teacher Training, Chapel Hill, North Carolina
5. Centre College of Kentucky	Dr. T. E. Cochran, Chairman, Danville, Kentucky
6. Greensboro College	President L. L. Gobbel, Chairman Greensboro, North Carolina

Attention is called to the fact that this Coöperative Study was undertaken and has developed without special allotment of funds or special meetings of those engaged in the Study. As was anticipated from the suggestions received last year, the importance of the problem of teacher education in the South and the universal interest in it have combined to carry the Study forward. Participants have realized that teacher education is a problem demanding all the resources of an institution, and perhaps of many institutions, for progress in working toward its solution. That is why so many groups with different interests and so many types of institutions are coöperating in the Study.

It is quite probable that this Study may have suffered from want of funds and meetings for the discussion of common problems. It is believed, however, that there are compensatory gains and that it will accomplish a number of important purposes. For one thing, the fact that many types of institutions and organizations are participating in the Study means that the attitudes of large numbers of faculty personnel, all interested in teacher education, will be represented. It may therefore be expected that the results of this study will be somewhat more representative of the practices in, philosophy of, and attitudes toward the education of teachers common through the South than most studies of this type.

Experience is also gained in coöordinating the work of widely separate groups with different interests and points of view into a composite, comprehensive, and representative report. Such experience in coöperative work developed without special facilities or funds may result in experience

which will be important for future work in the coöperative attack upon problems in higher education.

More important still, it is hoped that the study will result in the development of a body of material which will constitute a basis for careful study in the next general work conference and for the formulation of policies in teacher selection and education which will be generally accepted and applied throughout the area. If such policies should be developed out of this Study and should result in the growth of a coöperative attitude and a unified program of action in attacking the problems involved in teacher education in the member institutions of the Association, it would go far toward solving many of the most acute current educational problems in the South. It is confidently believed that some such contribution may be expected from this Coöperative Study.

The third important activity of the Committee has been the development of the following suggestion contained in the interim report to the Executive Committee of the Association:

"A final work conference under the present grant was tentatively planned for the coming summer, and the Committee has been making preparations for such a conference. Recent ODT orders have indicated that this conference should be deferred until a later date, and the Committee has acted accordingly. In lieu of a general conference, it is now planned to bring together a small committee for the purpose of summarizing the materials developed in the work conferences, coöperating institutions, and affiliated organizations and the drafting of a tentative statement on Southern Education based upon these studies. It is the feeling of the Committee that such a statement will be helpful in promoting further study in the South and will be an important point of departure in the general work conference which it is now hoped may be held in the summer of 1946. It is also felt that this tentative report will give an opportunity to the faculties of all institutions to study and to criticize the statement and to make revisions in the final work conference. It is felt that by these means the Committee may be able to draft a document on Southern Education which will be of great value in the future."

As soon as this proposal was approved the Executive Committee invited the following persons to meet in Atlanta on April 11, 1945, for further consideration of the proposal: Dr. Gordon W. Blackwell, Director of the Institute for Research in Social Sciences of the University of North Carolina; Dr. A. P. Brogan, Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Texas; Dr. J. L. Blair Buck, Director of Teacher Education in the Virginia State Department of Education; Dr. Philip Davidson, Dean of the Upper Division and Graduate School of Vanderbilt University; Dr. W. S. Hoole, Director of Libraries of the University of Alabama; and Dr. John E. Pomfret, Pres-

ident of the College of William and Mary. Dean J. H. Purks, Jr., of Emory University had also been invited but was unable to attend the meeting.

Consideration was given to problems which have been studied in coöperating institutions and to those on which further study is desirable. Agreement was reached on several matters involved in carrying out the program. Most important of all was the agreement of each person present to participate in the preparation of a particular segment of the proposed preliminary report. In order to give everyone an opportunity for consideration of appropriate procedures to be followed in this joint undertaking, a second meeting was schedule for Nashville, Tennessee, on June 22-23. All members of the group were present at this meeting, including Dean Purks.

At this second meeting the group considered the nature of the preliminary report, the relation of this undertaking to the whole program and purposes of the Association, the distribution of labor involved, and the appropriate procedures to be followed. Since the Committee on Work Conferences on Higher Education is a committee of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, which is not an association of professional schools, it was agreed that the report should be focused upon the central problem of higher education in its relationships as covered in the following tentative outline:

1. Historical background.
2. Results of studies already completed.
3. Outline program for education in the immediate future, a. Areas of basic education, b. Content of basic education, c. Additions to and changes needed in educational programs, d. New approaches proposed.
4. Improvement of instruction: evaluation, guidance, reading, and other methods and materials.
5. The function of the library.
6. Teacher education: secondary and collegiate; undergraduate and graduate.
7. Administration: responsibilities and relationships.
8. College and community.

The following distribution of labor was agreed upon for preparation of a first draft of the report:

1. Historical Background—Professor Edgar W. Knight.
2. Social Sciences—Dr. Gordon Blackwell.
3. Improving Qualitative Standards and Promoting Relationships in General and Professional Education—Dean A. P. Brogan.
4. Teacher Education—Dr. J. L. Blair Buck.
5. Liberal Arts and the Values of Research—Dean Philip Davidson.
6. The Library in Higher Education—Dr. W. S. Hoole.
7. Administrative and Faculty Relationships—President John E. Pomfret.
8. Natural Sciences—Dean J. H. Purks.
9. College and Community—Professor Roscoe E. Parker.

The group voted unanimously to invite Dr. Robert L. Sutherland, Director of the Hogg Foundation of the University of Texas, to join it and to prepare a study on Guidance and Personnel Problems. Happily, Dr. Sutherland has accepted the invitation and has agreed to prepare the requested report. This report will find a place in the outline above.

It is hoped that the report will call attention to basic courses which should be included in all educational programs and will accomplish three major purposes: 1. Bring together the results of institutional committees, work conferences, and other pertinent studies already completed; 2. Outline clearly and as effectively as possible the kinds of educational programs indicated or implied in these studies, including additions to and changes in the liberal arts curriculum; 3. Point out ways in which the suggested programs of education may be made effective, instruction improved, and advisory and clinical services developed.

Because of travel difficulties the group will undertake to prepare and exchange among all its members tentative drafts of the various reports for criticism. Each person will then prepare a semi-final draft of his report for further consideration at a meeting now planned for late autumn or early winter. The preliminary report will then be prepared, mimeographed, and distributed early in 1946 to all coöperating institutions for study, criticism, and revision in the work conference which it is hoped conditions will permit in the summer of 1946.

It is hoped that the revised report, containing amendments made by institutional committees and the general work conference, may be published through regular Association channels and made available to all member institutions. Such a report, when published, will complete one important part of the program of the Committee planned in 1943 and stated as follows in its *Third General Report* (p. 5):

"Following the final Work Conference under the present subsidy . . . a special committee should be appointed to bring together and put in permanent form the results of all studies made, both in the Work Conferences and in the institutions. The Committee believes that as a result of these studies made over a period of . . . years there should emerge definite suggestions for the improvement of the entire program of higher education in the South and that there should also emerge a better understanding of the contribution of the institutions of higher learning to modern times and conditions of living."

The Committee plans to continue during 1945-46 its coöperation with member institutions of the Association and with other agencies engaged in the study of higher education. It believes that it is serving and may continue to serve as a coördinating agency, through the office of its Executive Secretary, of a unique experiment in the coöperative study of higher education in an entire area. It realizes, however, that the success of this experiment depends upon the continued activity of institutional committees. It would therefore repeat a statement which embodies the principle by which it has been and still is guided:

"This unique opportunity carries with it heavy responsibility. If permanent and lasting values do not result from all the studies undertaken, a great

opportunity presented to higher education in the South will have been missed. Full advantage of this opportunity can be secured only if institutions, through their faculties and administrative officers, put forth every effort possible in carrying forward this Work Conference program."

The Committee also plans to complete and bring together the results of the Coöperative Study of Teacher Education which it is sponsoring. It is hoped that the results of this Study may be incorporated in the preliminary report, the completion and distribution of which now becomes a major undertaking for the coming year.

The Committee wishes to express its appreciation of the continued coöperation and support of member institutions and agencies of the Association. It is especially grateful to the Editor of the *QUARTERLY* for his generous attention to publication of materials submitted to him, to the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education for the release of funds allocated to but not used by its Committee on Evaluation, and to the Commission on Curricular Problems and Research for presenting its Interim Report to the Executive Committee of the Association.

The Committee would express its appreciation also for the coöperation of each of the organizations and its representative listed elsewhere in this report as participating in the Coöperative Study of Teacher Education, to members of the Staff of the United States Office of Education who have contributed valuable bibliographies and other aids during the year, and to the General Education Board for extending the unexpended balance of its grant for another two years.

Finally, the Committee is especially appreciative of the assistance of the men who are giving so generously of their time and energy to the preparation of the preliminary report on the work of the institutional committees, Work Conferences on Higher Education, and coöperating agencies—a report which promises to be a significant document for education in the South.

Respectfully submitted,

THE COMMITTEE ON WORK CONFERENCES ON HIGHER EDUCATION

ROSCOE E. PARKER, *Executive Secretary*

Editorial Notes

President G. D. Humphrey

The news that President G. D. Humphrey of Mississippi State College has accepted the presidency of the University of Wyoming and has resigned from the presidency of the Southern Association brings widespread regret. President Humphrey has the distinction of having served longer than any other president in the history of the Association and on the other hand never presiding over an annual meeting. He was elected at the Memphis meeting in December, 1942 and has, therefore, served more than two and one-half years. On account of war conditions and travel restrictions, the Executive Committee has had to act for the Association now for the third year. President Humphrey proved himself to be a wise and capable leader. We hope that when conditions permit a full meeting of the Association, the committee on program will see to it that he comes back, if at all possible, to tell in person the Association some of his experiences as wartime president. The only other wartime president the Association has had who had to carry on the Association with the lapse of one annual meeting was Dean C. G. Mathis of the University of Virginia, whose term extended over 1918 and 1919. The only president of the Association who was elected to a second term was Chancellor James H. Kirkland, regarded as founder of the organization, who served as its first secretary from 1895 to 1908, was elected president in 1911, and was then reelected president as a special honor for the twenty-fifth year of the Association (1920-21).

The New President of the Southern Association

President W. J. McConnell of North Texas State Teachers College, Denton, Texas, member of the Executive Committee, was elected president by the Committee acting under Article V, Section 1 (j) of the Constitution to succeed President Humphrey. He will serve until the next meeting of the Association and hopes travel conditions will permit a meeting to be held at least in the early spring, if not at the usual time. He sends greetings to the members of the Association and asks the same loyal support that has been accorded to President Humphrey.

The History of the Association

The next issue of the *QUARTERLY* will be devoted to a history of the Association, prepared by Dr. Guy E. Snively at the request of the Executive Committee in honor of the semi-centennial year of the Association. Bound copies will be available for members and friends of the Association desiring

em, if request is made to the QUARTERLY to reserve them. The cost will possibly not exceed two dollars.

This Issue of the Quarterly

The article on "The Veteran as a Postwar Student" was prepared by t. M. A. F. Ritchie, U.S.N.R.), who held the position as Director of Admissions at Roanoke College, Salem, Virginia at the time he entered the service of the Navy. He is, therefore, expressing the point of view of an administrator in the Association in the discussion that he presents.

The article, "Basil Manly, Frederick A. P. Barnard, and the University of Alabama Curriculum Inquiry, 1852-1854," presents an important episode emphasizing the idea brought out in many of the articles we have presented in the history of education in the South, as to the essential unity of development in secondary and higher education in the ante-bellum South and in the developments in other sections of the country.

The article, "Trinity College, 1839-1892: The Beginnings of Duke University," helps fill in the picture of education in the upper South that was painted in the articles in the May number on the University of Virginia, Randolph-Macon College, Vanderbilt, and the University of the South. This article, as most of the others, solidly grounds development of the institutions in the economic and social history of their area. As rapidly as other institutions can have articles prepared of similar nature, we hope to be able to present them to students of Southern educational history.

Another interesting contribution to the history of secondary and higher education in the upper South is the article, "Samuel Lander: Educational Pioneer," contributed by his daughter. Dr. Lander represented the type of native son who was less intent on duplicating what he had seen somewhere else than in solving his own problems in his own way. His experiment in concentrating on one subject at a time was a worthy forerunner of the intensive courses that have become so noteworthy in wartime training languages and have been the vogue in summer schools the last thirty years or more. Whenever we place emphasis on the practical learning of a given body of subject matter, concentration has a far more important place than additional educators have been willing to admit. A study of several subjects extended over a period of nine months in a group of immature students, whose social activities are an important part of their growth, serves the purpose of the college as "a place to grow up in" and should be justified on that ground; but to make a psychological assumption that there is some magical "time for absorption" enabling the student to learn more French, history, or mathematics, because he is distracted from each subject by the demands of the others and by his numerous other activities, is an assumption that has never been proved and quite probably never will be.

If learning the subject matter thoroughly is a prime purpose of education, Samuel Lander had good argument for concentrating on one subject at a time. He did not face the difficulty that colleges would face today—except in their summer sessions—in operating his plan, because the theory of specialization on the part of teachers had not been carried as far in his day as we have carried it. He and his faculty saw no reason why the teachers who taught Latin for seven weeks should not spend the next seven weeks teaching French or English or even ancient history or mathematics. It is a startling thing to contemplate the accurate scholarship of men like Lander in many fields of study. Scholars of his generation assumed a many-sidedness of interests and a study of many fields that today would bring ridicule upon their successors. The “quarter” system, however, that permits the student to work on three subjects for eleven or twelve weeks instead of upon five subjects for a semester of seventeen weeks is an interesting compromise looking toward concentration of presentation.

We are glad to present “A Brief History of the Kentucky Association of Colleges and Universities” by Dean James H. Hewlett, “The Association of Georgia Colleges” by Professor W. D. Hooper (who died since the preparation of his article), “The Association of Alabama Colleges” by Dean T. H. Napier, “The Tennessee College Association” by Professor C. Hodge Mathes, “A Brief History of the Mississippi Association of Colleges” by President J. H. Young, “The Louisiana College Conference: A Brief History” by Dean Harry L. Griffin.” These articles carry forward the series introduced by the article on South Carolina in the February issue and continued by the article on Texas in the May issue. We hope to have opportunity to present the other college associations in 1946. A study of the important dates in the history of these college associations furnishes material for interesting speculation in regard to the activities of the various state groups in the Association. For example, the unity of the Kentucky delegations during the period of adopting the new Constitution for the Association could very easily be explained in the light of Dean Hewlett’s article, for the Kentucky Association of Colleges since 1935 has been a joint association of secondary and higher institutions intended to build up coöperation. There are many other equally interesting suggestions contained in the series of articles for those who wish to make comparisons and pick them out.